BAPTIST REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

Vol. II. JULY, 1905. No. 3.

A STUDY OF THE SECOND GOSPEL.

BY PROF. HENRY C. VEDDER, D. D.

The second gospel has a special interest for students of the early Christian literature, in that it is now generally regarded as the oldest extant written form of the gospel. In this conclusion critics of all schools are practically unanimous. For the first thirty or forty years after the death of our Lord there was, so far as we know, only an oral gospel. If any attempts were made during this time to reduce this spoken gospel to writing, they were most likely short fragments of narrative or saying, none of which have survived. The collection of sayings of our Lord, or Logia, said by Papias to have been made by Matthew in Hebrew (Aramaic?), may or may not have been in existence before the second gospel was written, and may or may not have been known and used by the author. One school of critics very confidently assert that the Logia was in the hands of the author of this book, while other critics are equally positive that no certain traces of the Logia can be found in the text. Be this as it may, the second gospel is the earliest systematic account of the public life and labors of Jesus that has come down to us.

The book has also a special interest from the fact that it was used as a source, and was largely drawn upon, by the writers of the first and third gospels. The author of the third gospel—alike acording to tradition and critical scholarship, Luke—avowedly made use of the writings previously composed by "many." That our second

gospel, in substantially the form we now have it, was one of these sources is morally certain, as the "deadly parallel" sufficiently establishes. The exact verbal coincidences between the two writings are so numerous, so extensive and so peculiar, as to leave this conclusion in no sort of doubt. The only other hypothesis that could be entertained is that both writers borrowed from an earlier source the matter common to both—which is a more difficult theory, indeed, one impossible to support by even plausible arguments. But the first gospel also shows a similar dependence on the second, and the critical theory now generally accepted is that some writer, Matthew or another, took Matthew's Aramaic Logia, translated it into Greek, and wove the teachings of Jesus into the historic framework furnished by the second gospel, with some modifications derived from other sources.

Uniform Christian tradition ascribes the second gospel to Mark, as to its actual authorship, and to Peter as its chief source. All that we definitely know agrees so well with this tradition, and the characteristics of the book so strikingly confirm it, that no serious attempt has ever been made to set it aside as untrustworthy. On any reader of average literary sensibility, the second gospel will make a stronger first impression than either of the others, that it is the work of an eye-witness, or of one who had most of his information directly from an eye-witness. There is no need to argue a point that every critic concedes, and once for all, therefore, we assume Mark's authorship to be an unquestionable fact—this in spite of the anonymity of the book itself.

Of the author, the other New Testament documents give us considerable information. He may have been, as some have inferred, the "certain young man" mentioned in 14:51, 52, in connection with the arrest of Jesus, and the identification has this strong consideration in its favor: that the incident seems too trivial to have found a place in the history, even making due allowance for the author's tendency to add precise incidents and pictur-

esque description to his narrative, unless the object were a modestly veiled indication by the author that he had known Jesus and wrote some part of his story from personal recollection. But our first certain knowledge of the man is as the son of that Mary to whose house in Jerusalem Peter went when he was delivered from prison by God's angel (Acts 12:12). The family was one of some wealth and social consideration, as we may infer from this event. His name was John, but to this was added, according to the fashion of the time, the Roman surname Marcus. He must have been a disciple for some time (possibly he had become such during the lifetime of Jesus), for a recent and wholly inexperienced convert would hardly have been selected shortly after this as a companion to labor with Barnabas and Saul at Antioch (Acts 12:25), still less as their assistant on their first missionary tour (Acts 13:5). It is true that there were reasons aside from Mark's Christian character and general fitness for the work that doubtless had weight in this choice, for Barnabas and Mark were cousins (Col. 4:10); and as the younger man was familiar with the Greek language as well as the Aramaic, he could be useful in many ways.

But when this journey was only well begun, the gospel having been preached only in Cyprus, John left his companions and returned to Jerusalem (Acts 13:13). The reasons for this action are unknown to us, and of their validity we are therefore in no position to judge; we do know, however, that whatever they may have been, they failed to commend themselves as sufficient to the Apostle Paul. In his judgment, the conduct of Mark was blameworthy, and the matter therefore became an occasion of a "sharp contention" between himself and Barnabas later, and of their separation (Acts 15:37-39). Mark went with Barnabas and then disappears for a time from our view. About ten years later, Paul, then a prisoner at Rome, commends Mark to the church at Colosse (Col. 4:10), showing that if the apostle had at one time thought

his young helper faint-hearted or otherwise blameworthy, the latter's subsequent faithful labors had more than atoned for the error of a youth perhaps too impulsive and unstable. The salutation in which Mark joins at the close of the letter to Philemon (v. 24)—of all the New Testament epistles the sweetest and most intimate—shows that he was one of the inner circle of Paul's acquaintances at Rome. As the apostle's end drew nigh, it should seem that Mark had left him on some mission; and the heart of the lonely old man yearns for his younger friend and ministrant. He writes pitifully to Timothy, "Take Mark and bring him with thee, for he is useful to me for ministering." (2 Tim. 4:11). After the death of Paul we have but one mention of Mark, but that one is very significant. At the close of the first epistle of Peter we find Mark spoken of as "my son." This familiar and affectionate designation indicates a very close relation between the now venerable apostle and his younger brother, and strongly confirms the tradition that the substance of the second gospel is largely Petrine.

One cannot well ignore the fact that this epistle is one whose genuineness is stoutly disputed, and that many scholars of the highest repute would date its composition as late as the middle of the second century. Well, even if that should one day turn out to be the accepted conclusion of Christian scholarship (which for one I cannot believe will be the case), it would still be true that this mention of Mark as the "son" of Peter, though no longer a historical verity, would be an expression of the general conviction in the second century as to the long and intimate relations between these two men.

As to the time and place of writing, but slight evidence is afforded by the document itself, and tradition adds no trustworthy data. From ch. xiii. it may be inferred with tolerable certainty that the gospel, in its present form, could not have been written after the destruction of Jerusalem. Critical scholarship is now pretty well agreed on the date 70 A. D. This, of course, is a conclusion based

on our present Greek text. There is a theory, dear to many scholars, of an Ur-Markus, or Proto-Mark, an Aramaic original of which the gospel as we now have it is a translation, or perhaps a later and enlarged edition. Though some great names can be cited for this theory, one is strongly tempted, even at the risk of seeming disrespectful to one's betters, to pronounce it simply a figment of the critical imagination. Tradition says that the gospel was written at Rome, but this tradition stands or falls with the accompanying tradition of Peter's Roman episcopate, which is generally discredited. The gospel itself plainly shows, as will be presently made clear, that it was written for Western readers, if not written in the West; and it contains both an unusual number and an unusual proportion of Latin words, showing that the writer had been at some time under strong Roman influence.

The vocabulary of the second gospel consists of some 1350 words, including 60 proper names. Excluding the latter, there are 80 words found in no other New Testameet writer, about 150 found only in Matthew and Luke, and 100 more than are among the rarer New Testament words. Many of Mark's words are colloquial rather than literary Greek, and there are not a few foreign words simply transliterated into Greek. Of Aramaic origin are: *ἀββά*, *ἐφφαθά*, *κορβάν*, *κούμ*, *λαμά*, *ῥαββουνεί*, *σαβαχθανεί*, *ταλειθσ* besides some uncommon proper names, like *Βοανεργές* and *Γολγοθά*. The Latin words *δηνάριον*, *κεντυριων*, *κῆνσοζ*, *κοδράντης*, *κράβαττος*, *λεγιών*, *ξέστης*, *σπεκουλάτωρ*, *φραγελλώσας*. Of Mark's vocabulary as a whole it may be fairly said that it is such Greek as a man might be expected to acquire in his age by conversation with miscellaneous people, with little or no reading of Greek literature.

The grammatical peculiarities of Mark are what we should expect of a writer to whom Aramaic was a mother tongue, and whose knowledge of Greek was colloquial rather than literary. He lapses into Aramaic idioms oc-

casionally, and adopts those Latin constructions that were doubtless common in spoken Greek. There are many abrupt, broken and imperfect sentences, also, that would not be found in the writings of one who had a more literary training. There is frequent confusion of pronouns, αὐτός being used in different cases in the same sentence referring to different persons. All these things confirm the hypothesis that the author rather picked up his Greek as he could than regularly learned it.

And yet, Mark is a writer of no small literary skill. He is the most pictorial, vivid, vehement of the gospel writers. Many of what the grammarian calls inelegancies or errors of style are due not so much to ignorance of what elegant Greek requires as to his comparative indifference to elegance, provided he can express his meaning, and express it in the fewest words. There is in this gospel a sense of movement, of rapid progression towards the goal, that is found in hardly any other New Testament writing. The author cannot stop to complete his sentences, so impatient is he to get on with his story. He sometimes groups things together with little regard to exact chronological order—not like Matthew, because the things belong together in order of thought, if not of time, but because he hurries on with breathless haste from event to event, eager to tell his whole story as quickly as he may. The impetuous Peter has communicated much of his nature to his disciple and mouthpiece.

This general impression is produced by a few very simple means. The feeling of movement as one reads is largely due to the peculiar use of the tenses of the Greek verbs. The historical present is almost continuous, while the perfect is also freely used—both where other writers would use the aorist, as the strict usage of the Greek language demands. When past time must be spoken of, two forms are favorites: if an action is expressed by the verb chosen, it is commonly in the imperfect; if a state, then ἦν with a present participle is the form generally employed. The aorist, which with most historical writers is the pre-

dominant form, is conspicious in Mark mainly by its absence. In addition, there are a multitude of little touches introduced that give vividness to the narrative. A comparison of parallel passages in Matthew and Luke shows that almost every sentence of Mark's contains an epithet, an abverb, a phrase that the others lack, and these litttle additions will be found to be precisely that which gives the gospel its characteristic flavor. Another peculiarity is the use of the Greek particles. Of these Mark is sparing, but the few that he uses he uses constantly. He almost never introduces a new topic with οὖν (John's favorite word), the τότε of which Matthew is so fond, or the δέ that is constantly occurring in Luke. His paragraphs are loosely strung together with a succession of καί's. This, while it weakens the sense of close logical connection, enhances the feeling of rapid movement that has already been produced in the reader by other means. The favorite connecting word after καί is εὐθύς, which occurs no fewer than 42 times in the first nine chapters—after that less frequently. On the other hand, though Mark is thus careless of particles, he is careful and discriminating above most New Testament writers in his use of prepositions, as becomes one who is anxious to convey his thought accurately to others.

The purpose of the writer must be gathered from the book itself. That is a very superficial view which contents itself with seeing nothing in the gospel but the life of Christ. If the author's purpose had been historical or biographical, he would have produced a very different book, one far more complete in details; for it cannot be reasonably assumed that Mark knew no incidents or sayings that he has not recorded. The book has just as practical a purpose as the preaching of the apostles had—namely, to produce conviction in the minds of those who should read, that Jesus was the Christ, a divine being who had brought to men the glad tidings of the kingdom of God. That the gospel was designed not for Jewish but for Gentile readers, is plain from the careful explana-

tions introduced wherever peculiar Jewish customs are mentioned—a thing superfluous, and even ridiculous, if Jewish readers were in the writer's mind. To put the author's purpose in a single sentence, therefore, it was to give in a continous and orderly narrative as much regarding the labors and teachings of Jesus of Nazareth as was necessary and adapted to produce the conviction among Gentile readers that he was the Son of God, whose mission to the world was to set up the kingdom of God among men. This thought is present to the writer's mind, from beginning to end, controls the choice and arrangement of his material and dictates the use to be made of it.

Those who have called the second gospel an "artless" writing are perhaps justified in their use of the epithet, if it is restricted to the meaning "unartificial;" but if it should be taken to mean that the book is put together at haphazard, without any definite plan—the writer simply stringing together incidents and sayings as they happened to occur to him, with perhaps some vague idea of following a chronological order, but nothing further—no word could be less descriptive. A slight examination discloses the general outlines of a very precise and carefully elaborated plan, of which a closer study will discover all the details. The matter falls into two main divisions: the ministry in Galilee and the passion at Jerusalem. The first thirteen verses are obviously intended to be introductory to the main story, which begins with the public proclamation of the kingdom by Jesus. The last twelve verses must be pronounced, on many grounds, an Appendix* added by some later writer, who was disturbed by the abrupt ending of the book—an ending, however, no whit more abrupt than the beginning, and both

*Note on the last twelve verses.—The textual evidence is conclusive. This appendix is lacking in ℵ, B, one Ms. of Lat. Vet. and MSS. of Arm. and Eth. versions. Several MSS. and versions give another and shorter conclusion. According to the MS. recently discovered of an Armenian version (Conybeare), this passage was added by the presby-

characteristic of Mark. Careful study of the main divisions results in the following:

ANALYSIS.

Introduction: .*Events Preliminary to Christ's Public Ministry.*

The ministry of John the Baptist.....1:1-8
The baptism of Jesus 1:9-11
The temptation 1:12, 13

PART I. THE GALILEAN MINISTRY.

I. The First Tour Through Galilee.

1. *Jesus begins his ministry.*
   He announces the kingdom of God 1:14, 15
   Calls the first disciples 1:16-20
   A day in Capernaum 1:20-34

2. *The work widens.*
   Preaches and heals in the synagogue of Galilee 1:35-39
   Heals a leper.....1:40-45

3. *Beginning of conflict with the Pharisees.*
   The charge of blasphemy 2:1-12
   Teaches by the seaside 2:13
   Call of Levi—consorting with sinners 2:14-17
   Dispute regarding fasting 2:18-22
   Alleged violation of the Sabbath.....2:23-3:6
   Increasing popularity—second concourse by the sea 3:7-12

---

ter Ariston (Aristion). The internal evidence is also against the genuineness of the passage; see the very acute and conclusive discussion by Professor Gould at the close of his International Commentary on Mark. An Aristion was mentioned by Papias as one of the disciples of our Lord. (Eusebius, H. E. iii. 39.)

Jesus appoints the twelve.....3:13-19
Charge of Diabolism 3:20-30
The true family of Jesus 3:30-35

4. *Teachings regarding the kingdom.*
Parable of the sower 4:1-9
Interpretation of the parable.....4:10-21
Parabolic warnings on hearing the word...4:21-25
Parable of the seed and the soil.....4:26-29
Parable of the mustard seed 4:30-32
Jesus' parabolic teaching in general.....4:33,34

5. *His power shown by miracles.*
He stills the tempest 4:35-41
Heals the demoniac of the Gerasenes.....5:1-20
Heals the woman with an issue of blood ...5:25-34
Raises the daughter of Jairus.....5:21-24; 35-43

6. *Teaches in the synagogue at Nazareth and is rejected* 6:1-6

II. The Second Tour in Galilee.

1. *Some incidents of the tour.*
He sends out the twelve—their successful labors 6:6-13
Herod hears of Jesus 6:14-16
Digression on Herod's murder of John 6:17-29
Return of the twelve—Jesus withdraws...6:30-32
Feeding of the five thousand 6:33-44
Jesus walks on the water 6:45-52

2. *Growing popularity and increasing opposition.*
The people throng Jesus.....6:53-56
The Phrisees and their traditions.....7:1-23
Withdraws to Tyre and Sidon—heals a child 7:24-30
Returns to Decapolis—heals a deaf man...7:31-37
Feeding the four thousand.....8:1-10
Pharisees seek a sign—disciples warned...8:11-21
Heals a blind man at Bethsaida.....8:22-26

III. The Training of the Twelve.

1. *The Shadow of the cross.*
   - Peter's confession 8:27-30
   - Passion of Christ foretold—rebuke of Peter 8:31-9:1
   - The transfiguration 9:2-8
   - Elijah and the Son of Man 9:9-13
   - Healing of the demoniac boy 9:14-29
   - Passion foretold a second time 9:30-32

2. *The nature of the kingdom.*
   - The law of greatness 9:33-37
   - Spirit of exclusiveness condemned 9:38-41
   - On giving occasions of stumbling 9:42-50
   - The law of marriage re-enacted 10:1-12
   - The conditions of entrance into the kingdom 10:13-16
   - The rich and the kingdom 10:17-31

PART II. THE PASSION AT JERUSALEM.

1. *The journey towards Jerusalem.*
   - The coming passion foretold the third time 10:32-34
   - The ambition of the sons of Zebedee 10:35-45
   - The healing of Bartimaeus 10:46-52
   - The triumphant entry into the city 11:1-10

2. *Jesus in the temple.*
   - The first day (Sunday) 11:11
   - The second day (Monday).
     - The fig tree cursed 11:12-14
     - The temple cleansed 11:15-19
   - The third day (Tuesday).
     - Prayer 11:20-26
     - Christ's authority challenged 11:27-33
     - Parable of the vineyard 12:1-12
     - The question of tribute 12:13-17
     - Sadducees test Jesus 12:18-27
     - The first commandment 12:28-34

Scribes tested and warned.....12:35-40
The poor widow 12:41-44
Destruction of the temple and end of the age.ch. 13

3. *The last Supper.*
The plot of the priests 14:1, 2
Digression on the supper at Bethany.....14:3-9
The treason of Judas.....14:10-11
The passover feast.....14:12-21
The eucharist instituted.....14:22-25
Peter's boast and warning.....14:26-31
The agony in Gethsemane.....14:32-42

4. *The arrest and trial.*
Betrayed by Judas and seized.....14:43-50
The episode of the young man.....14:51, 52
The examination before the high priest.....14:53-65
Peter's denial 14:66-72
The formal trial and sentence.....15:1
The trial before Pilate and condemnation....15:2-15

5. *The crucifixion.*
Jesus scourged and mocked.....15:15-20
The way to the cross.....15:20-22
The crucifixion and the first three hours....15:23-32
The last three hours and death of Jesus.....15:33-41

6. *The burial* 15:42-47

7. *The resurrection* 16:1-8

APPENDIX BY ANOTHER HAND.

The epiphanies of Jesus.....16:9-14
The Great Commission.....16:15-18
The ascension and the preaching of the gospel..16:19, 20

Modern scientific exegesis proceeds upon this principle: in the interpretation of any writing, each word and phrase must be explained, not only with help of dictionary and grammar and concordance, but in harmony with what can be ascertained of the author, the time and place

of composition, the purpose of writing, the context, and the general course of thought. The matters already discussed are, therefore, an indispensable preparation for successful exegetical study of Mark's text. But another thing is equally indispensable—namely, accurate acquaintance with the course of thought throughout the gospel. Let us endeavor to summarize this.

The gospel begins with an abruptness that we soon learn to be characteristic of Mark's style. There are no long genealogies prefixed, there is no account of the birth, infancy and adolescence of Jesus. The writer's purpose requires concentration of attention upon the public ministry of Jesus, and the consequent ignoring of all that preceded. Its theme is the glad tidings of Jesus, the anointed of God. The mission of Christ has been foretold in the prophets, and the coming of John, the forerunner, was likewise foretold. Jesus begins his ministry by submitting to baptism at the hands of John, and God puts the seal of a public approval upon this formal self-dedication to a life of service. The temptation, which immediately follows as a further preparation for the work, is not described in detail, but merely mentioned; and with the hurried introduction the author plunges into the midst of his story. Ignoring entirely the Judean work, of which John so fully informs us, he describes the ministry of Jesus in Galilee.

According to Mark, as also Matthew and Luke agree, Jesus began his work by the proclamation that the kingdom of God was at hand, and his early teaching was regarding this kingdom. But Mark gives less of this teaching than the others, and makes it far less plain what Jesus meant by the kingdom of God. If we had only the second gospel our conception of the kingdom would be hazy and uncertain, for the reason that Mark continually directs our attention to the King rather than to the kingdom. It is the character, the personality of Jesus as disclosed by his words and works that is constantly held before our minds.

From the first Jesus selects out from the mass of his hearers a few disciples to whom he may impart his full teaching. Andrew and Simon, James and John, are the first to be so chosen ;and thenceforth they are constantly with their Master. Jesus authenticates his teaching from the beginning by the performance of miracles, works of healing exclusively at first, but healings evidently not inspired by mere pity, for relatively few are healed and these are not sought out. A Sabbath at Capernaum is memorable for his presence. His teaching astonishes his hearers by its tone of authority, no less than by its character, so different in both respects from that of the scribes and Pharisees. But that he has a divine mission, and hence is justified in speaking with unique authority, Jesus shows by healing a man possessed by an unclean spirit. Entering into Simon's house, he heals his wife's mother of a fever. These things are noised abroad, and the whole city is in an uproar. A new prophet has come! As soon as the Sabbath is over, the people bring their sick to Jesus and he heals many.

The ministry has begun with a great success, as men count success, but Jesus did not so regard it. The people did not ask to hear more of his teaching, but only to receive greater benefit from his power to heal. They have perceived no spiritual significance in these healings, they see only the outward and sensuous side of them. Yet these miracles, like all that Christ wrought, were object lessons, intended not merely or chiefly to relieve human suffering, but to teach a spiritual truth. Every man has within him an unclean spirit that must be cast out before Jesus can reign in his heart. Sin is a disease more grievous than any fever, and to Jesus as our Great Physician we must come for soul-healing. This was what he desired the people of Capernaum to know and feel, but they could only see the wonderful healings from bodily disease. With a blindness that we condemn even while we share it, they refused to look beneath the surface of things, and on his part Jesus refused to

have his work degraded into the mere relief of bodily infirmities. That was not his mission to men—it was but a mere incident—he had come to save men from their sins, of which the bodily healing was but a symbol. And besides, the excitement produced by these miracles threatened to make continuance of his work difficult or impossible. He retires from the house for solitary prayer, and then, resisting all importunities to return, he sets out on a tour of the towns of Galilee, teaching in their synagogues and healing. One of his miracles, the healing of a leper, whose obvious significance is so plain that it is unnecessary to dwell upon it, results in so great popular excitement that he is obliged to shun the towns and teach in the wilderness those who resorted to him.

After allowing an interval for the excitement to subside, he again visits Capernaum. There has been time for the people to talk much about his words and deeds, and already opinions begin to differ widely. The multitude are still of the opinion that Jesus is a prophet; the Pharisees are skeptical, inclined to challenge his authority, to compare his teaching closely with their traditions, and to pounce upon anything in teaching or conduct that seems open to criticism. They are the more inclined to this course because Jesus has not been trained by the rabbis, yet is assuming the function of a religious teacher, and is called rabbi by the people. Under these circumstances a collision is not long in occurring. The occasion is the healing of a paralytic. His friends, not being able to get into the house, carry the sick man up the outside staircase upon the flat roof, lay aside the tiles or mats and let the man down at the very feet of Jesus. It was no common case. The man had been guilty of some sin or vice (so one infers) of which the paralysis was a consequence. Jesus goes to the root of the matter: not bodily healing, but cleansing of the inner man, is what this sufferer needs, and accordingly it is the forgiveness of his sins that is first promised him. This is the

opportunity for which the Pharisees sought; they promptly prefer a charge of blasphemy, to which Jesus makes unanswerable reply by healing the man's bodily infirmity. For if he had not authority from God to forgive sins, how could he have power from God to make a paralytic walk?

The Pharisees are discomfited, but not convinced. The call of Levi and the feast that the new disciple made furnish occasion for a second charge: Jesus violates tradition by eating with persons notorious for laxity regarding the law, and of ill-repute generally, traitors to race and religion—publicans and sinners. Shortly after, a third accusation is made: Jesus, or his disciples by his authority, neglects the Pharisaic practice regarding fasting. Technical violation of the rules regarding the Sabbath, first by the disciples, then by Jesus himself, furnishes the material for a fourth charge by the Pharisees.

In short, it becomes apparent that a breach exists between Jesus and the Pharisees that can never be closed, but must, on the contrary, become wider. Jesus cannot accept their narrow traditions, which in so many cases have made void the law. He cannot conform his teaching to their false ideas of both God and man. The time has come when the law, in its inmost meaning, is to be fulfilled and set aside, and a new order is to take its place. The Pharisees understand the case correctly, in so far as they understand it at all—if this new doctrine were to prevail, they and all that they represent and hold dear must pass away. Accordingly, they begin to take counsel with the party of Herod how they may destroy Jesus. Thus early in his ministry, we see its violent end foreshadowed.

Jesus therefore withdraws from the towns, and from a boat teaches the multitudes that gather by the seaside. The progress of his work is marked by the appointment of the Twelve, who are henceforth recognized as his disciples in a special sense. The Pharisees have not been placated in the least by his new policy, and they seek him

out to make a fresh accusation against him, the charge of diabolism. It is vain for them to deny that some supernatural power aids him in the casting out of demons, but they boldly charge that it is an evil power—he casts out demons by the prince of the demons. The utter absurdity of such an accusation Jesus clearly shows; nothing but blind hate and unreasoning jealousy could have made it. While the debate is going on, word is brought to Jesus that his mother and brothers are without and would speak with him. This incident is related by Matthew and Luke also, but Mark alone supplies the clue to its real significance. As we read in the other gospels, the reply of Jesus seems unnecessarily harsh, but Mark tells us that his family had come to lay hold on Jesus and take him away, because, as they said, "He is out of his mind." This is why Jesus is compelled to repudiate earthly ties, as having any power to restrain him in his ministry, and to announce the higher bond that he establishes—henceforth they are his real kindred who do the will of God.

Again he goes forth to teach by the seaside. And now Mark pauses in his narrative of events to give us some samples of the teaching. After the manner of Oriental instructors generally, Jesus speaks in parables. There was a special reason why he should adopt this method: he could not teach his doctrine openly concerning the kingdom, and proclaim himself the king, without danger of bringing his work to an untimely end. Already the excitement was great and daily growing, while the opposition of the Pharisees was developing a bitterness that threatened immediate violence. That his work could not continue long at best was already apparent, but he must run no risk of having it prematurely cut short. Accordingly, "he spoke the word to them as they were able to hear it."

The parables given by Mark are but three (for what is sometimes called the parable of the lamp is rather an illustration in his discourse than a parable). They have a common object and a common teaching. The object is

to correct misapprehensions regarding the kingdom and its king. The Jews are expecting an earthly kingdom, something to be set up by authority and maintained by force ;the Romans are to be overthrown, and Jerusalem is to become the center of an empire that shall surpass the glories of Solomon. There is danger, we learn from the other gospels, that the multitude will seize him and proclaim him the Messiah, and begin a rebellion against Rome which could only end in bloodshed and disaster. But Jesus wishes men to understand that the kingdom he has come to found is not earthly but heavenly, not carnal but spiritual, a kingdom that comes not by observation, but in the hearts of men—it is a seed that grows, its progress is to be quiet, almost imperceptible, but nevertheless real and great. The kingdom can progress only as its principles find lodgment in hearts prepared to receive it; but once accepted, it increases by an irresistible force; and in its ultimate development it will astonish the world by its magnitude. It is plain that Mark chooses just these parables and no others, not because others were unknown to him, but because they were less germane to his purpose.

The writer now resumes his narrative with an account of four great miracles. The stilling of the tempest is a demonstration that this is God's world, and not Satan's, though the latter has in great part subdued it unto his purposes; that "the power resident in nature is in its last analysis spiritual, and that Jesus is the agent of that Power" (Gould); that those who believe in him are no longer to be under the dominion of Satan in any way, but Christ's salvation is a complete deliverance. The healing of the demoniac illustrates anew the power of Jesus over the evil spirits, but it also gives a fresh illustration of the utter selfishness of the motives that actuated most of the people who thronged him. So long as the miracles were clearly beneficent and ministered to their advantage, they were welcomed; but the moment one appeared to be destructive to their property, they

clamored for his departure.* The healing of the woman, by its special features, shows more strikingly the power of Jesus over disease. These works culminate in the raising of the daughter of Jairus, by which it is made manifest that Jesus can deliver even from the power of death. The evidence of miracles can no further go.

And now this tour throughout Galilee is fittingly concluded by a visit to his own town, Nazareth. Whether this is the same visit recorded in Luke 4:16-30 is a question about which there has been and may be considerable difference of opinion. If it is, Mark was most impressed not so much by the violence as by the unbelief of the people. Everywhere else Jesus had been received as a prophet; though the Pharisees had cavilled, the people had believed in him, hung upon his words, followed him —not in pure disinterestedness, it is true, not in faith of the highest sort, but in faith of a sort. But here, in his own town, his message is received coldly and his wonder-working powers are doubted by those who know him best. They were too well acquainted with Jesus the carpenter to believe in Jesus the prophet.

A second circuit of Galilee immediately begins, and this period of Christ's ministry is marked by increasing definiteness in his instructions, still more rapid growth of his popularity, and also by more fixity of purpose on the part of his opponents.

For the first time Jesus now calls his disciples to his aid in proclaiming the kingdom, sending forth the Twelve two by two through Galilee. A much briefer account of their instructions is given by Mark than by Matthew (ch. 10), because the mission itself, not the teaching, is the important thing to the former. This mission is only less successful than the labors of Jesus himself, and the

* It will be noted that in sending away the healed man, Jesus gives the opposite injunction from that usual with him: he commands the man to tell everybody what had been done. This was because Jesus had no intention of remaining in this region, and the wide publication of the miracle could cause no hindrance to his work, but might be valuable as testimony.

report of it comes to the ears of Herod, whose guilty conscience and superstition prompt the explanation that Jesus is John the Baptist risen from the dead. This suggests to the writer a digression in which the murder of John by Herod is recounted. (6:14-29.)

The Twelve return, with a report of their labors, and Jesus takes them into the wilderness for rest and further instruction. But the people followed, and to relieve their necessities Jesus miraculously feeds five thousand of them. Mark does not pause to consider the spiritual significance of this miracle, as does John, whose theme requires such discussion, while Mark's does not. The miracle of the walking on the waves is necessary to impress once more on the minds of the disciples, so slow to apprehend truth, the supreme authority of Jesus over the powers of nature, as well as the powers of evil.

From this time forward the excitement in Galilee becomes intense. Jesus can go nowhere without a popular uprising, and the bringing of the sick from all quarters, that he may heal them. But of evidence that the people have made any progress in the understanding of his glad tidings, we do not find a tittle. In equal measure the opposition of the Pharisees becomes embittered. The final clash comes when they attack Jesus because his disciples do not observe the traditional rules about ceremonial defilement, which have far exceeded those prescribed in the Law. Jesus replies with greatest boldness and explicitness. He denounces them as hypocrites, who are intent only on an external righteousness, caring nothing for genuine righteousness towards God. After showing them how they violate the spirit of the law in their zeal for the letter, he makes the breach irreparable by brushing away the whole law of defilement, the Mosaic original as well as the accretions of tradition, as something now obsolete. Nothing really defiles a man but what proceeds out of his mouth; to his followers all food is clean; and Christianity is then and there proclaimed to be a religion not for the Jew only, but for all men. The Pharisees under-

stood fully the import of the answer; that between their system and this new teaching there was henceforth a deadly warfare—one or the other must perish.

And Jesus sees this yet more clearly than they. He has pronounced his ultimatum, and the result can only be his own death. A few weeks, or months at most, remain to him. He wishes to employ these to the best advantage, in the instruction of the Twelve, and he now attempts to withdraw from his public ministry for this purpose. In this he is not at first successful. He goes into the region of Tyre and Sidon, but even here his fame follows him. He goes to Decapolis, with the same result. He retires to the wilderness, and again the multitude follows. The miracles related in connection with these journeyings are again strikingly symbolic—a demon cast out, a deaf man healed, the four thousand fed, a blind man restored to sight—and again they form a climax that proves them to have been selected and placed with a definite purpose, not by accident, nor yet according to their chronological order merely.*

In the region near Cæsarea Philippi Jesus finally succeeds in gaining the desired privacy, and begins the instruction of his disciples. Up to this time he has not proclaimed his Messiaship, has even carefully avoided the ascription of such a title to him by others. Now the time has come to speak out, and the Twelve are disposed to hear and believe. Indeed, they have already believed before he speaks; for though Peter, ever foremost and impulsive, is the one who makes the great confession, the rest are not far behind. His words, "Thou art the Christ," find an echo in the hearts of all the Twelve. But while Jesus accepts as his due this confession of their faith, and thus for the first time formally acknowledges his Messianic character and mission, it is a thing for the present to be known only to his closest disciples, and he

* It is worth noting also that in both cases where he gives a group of miracles, Mark gives a group of four.

strictly charges them that there is to be no public announcement until he shall give the word.

In the meantime he goes on to teach them further concerning the true nature of his Messiaship. The Twelve shared the errors of their race and time, and were looking for a triumphant Messiah and an earthly kingdom. Jesus now warns them that the Messiah is to be no conquering Prince, but that he will be rejected by the chiefs of the nation; that he is not to reign gloriously on the throne of David, but will shortly suffer an ignominious death, yet will rise again after three days. The latter assurance falls upon deaf ears, it is meaningless to them, but the former they understand only too well. It is a thunderbolt from the blue; it means the death of all their hopes. Peter cannot bear it, and begins to remonstrate with him; whereupon Jesus sternly rebukes Peter as an emissary of Satan who is trying to prevent him from accomplishing the will of God.

This conversation has taken place in private, but others are near by and Jesus now calls them up and expounds to them for the first time the inmost secret of his teaching. They who follow him must be like him, deny self and lose life in order to save it. Those only can reign with him in his kingdom who have died with him. These words could not then be understood, but they might be remembered, and later, in the light of his death and resurrection, their meaning would appear. From this time the shadow of the cross is never lifted from Jesus and his disciples.

We can easily figure to ourselves after a sort the surprise, the disappointment, the bewilderment, the dismay, that this teaching must have caused in the minds of the disciples, but can we fully realize their feelings? How doubts must have assailed them—can this really be the Christ after all? We shall not go wrong if we see in the transfiguration a purpose to answer these doubts, to confirm their wavering faith, to strengthen the disciples for the still more bitter trial to come. Jesus conversing

with Moses and Elijah, Jesus shining with a glory supernal, Jesus acknowledged to be Son of God by a voice from heaven—these were things fitted to carry conviction to Jewish minds that this is indeed the Anointed of God—a conviction that could never be wholly overthrown by whatever might thereafter occur. The healing of the demoniac boy that immediately followed has the same purpose—it is in many ways the most dramatic and striking exhibition of their Master's power that has occurred during his ministry, and must have been powerful to confirm their faith in him.

Leaving this region for a final visit to Galilee, both brief and secret, Jesus a second time foretells his death and resurrection. On this occasion the effect on the disciples is less startling than before. It does not appear, however, that any more permanent impression is made on their minds. They still cannot reconcile this teaching with their ideas of the Messiah and his kingdom, but, remembeing the severe rebuke of Peter on the former occasion, they are afraid to ask for further explanation. As the journey is continued towards Capernaum, the disciples fall into a dispute—Christ's words would probably suggest to them a discussion of the coming kingdom—who of them was greatest. It has not passed unnoticed by their Master. When they had entered into a house at Capernaum, Jesus administers a fitting rebuke, and takes occasion to make clearer to them the nature of his kingdom. The way to greatness in the kingdom of God, as his whole life taught men, is through service. He takes a little child, doubtless one of the family whose guests they were, sets him in the midst as an object lesson, and warns them against the pride and haughtiness that would exclude others from the kingdom, and that furnish occasions of stumbling to Christ's little ones.

Jesus now bids farewell to Galilee, and enters upon a brief ministry in Judea and Perea. These labors, which must have occupied some months, are described with considerable fullness by John and Luke—particularly by the

latter, who gives more than one-third of his gospel to the miracles and parables belonging to this part of our Lord's life. Mark condenses his account into little more than half a chapter. When the character of this additional material given by Luke and John is carefully examined, the reason for Mark's brevity becomes evident enough. Mark's purpose was not biographical, and to have given a full account of this part of the labors of Jesus would have led him far afield—most of what is given by Luke and John would have been irrelevant in his narrative, and would evidently have weakened the impression that he desired to make. Mark selects three incidents, that are germane to his purpose, because Jesus seizes upon each of them to continue his instructions to his disciples concerning the principles of his kingdom. The Pharisees proposed a question concerning divorce, and Jesus makes this the occasion to declare the true law of marriage. Purity is the foundation principle of the kingdom. The disciples would prevent mothers (as they thought) from annoying their Master, by bringing their children to him to be blessed, and he makes this a text for teaching them the terms of entrance into the kingdom. Not birth, not wealth, not fame, not power, but the spirit of a little child—meekness, docility, obedience—is the condition of membership. The rich young man, whom Jesus loved, but who went away sorrowful when called to sacrifice his great possessions, suggests a discourse on riches and a warning to the disciples not to let the things of this world come between them and the kingdom.

The second main division of the gospel begins here. The public ministry is substantially completed; the disciples have been given all the instruction they are able to receive; Jesus goes up to Jerusalem to accept the title of Messiah and to suffer the death that must inevitably follow. In spite of all that he has said to them, the Twelve have no clear comprehension of what is to happen, but vague forebodings of evil weigh upon their spirits and they follow in fear, which is by no means

lessened by a third and more explicit prediction of the death about to be suffered by their Master. Yet, in spite of this, it is possible for the sons of Zebedee to show that rivalries and jealousies are found among the Twelve, and that desire for the material rewards of discipleship is still the chief motive of the best among them. With a patient persistence possible to no other teacher that ever lived, Jesus again strives to show how foreign their spirit is to the kingdom he is establishing, of which service is the law, in which self-abnegation is the only path to greatness, as his own life clearly illustrates.

But one other incident of the journey is related, the healing of Bartimaeus, and the choice of this by Mark seems to be not so much for the sake of the miracle itself, as for the recognition by the blind man of the official character of Jesus. In hailing him as "son of David," Bartimaeus shows how the rising tide of Messianic hope among the people is accompanied by increasing definiteness of belief in Jesus as the promised Deliverer of Israel. The healing is, in comparison with this, a wholly subordinate matter, yet its effect must have been greatly to enhance the popular excitement.

The crisis, the culmination, of the earthly career of Jesus is the triumphant entry into Jerusalem. Up to this time he has carefully repressed the enthusiasm of the multitudes about him, he has refused to permit himself to be called Christ, he has warned the Twelve not to make known to others his Messianic character. But now the time has come to cast off this reserve, to accept and wear his true title. To delay his acknowledgment longer would seem like cowardly denial. Therefore he deliberately permits the enthusiasm of the crowds to have its way, he formally accepts the Messianic title as his by right. And it is significant of his methods also that he has not himself announced his royal dignity and mission, but has waited until this shall be voluntarily accepted and spontaneously proclaimed by others. Jesus was well aware that in this action he had signed his own

death warrant—the sacrifice made a few days later on Calvary was made in spirit then and there. In assuming the title and character of Messiah, he assumes the work of the servant of Jehovah, as Isaiah had foretold it, to be made the sin-offering of God's people. This is why this scene is the culmination of his earthly life—all that follows of the story of the passion is but the necessary result of what is here seen and done.

It is not necessary, therefore to follow step by step the details of the last days, because the purpose of Mark is here too plain for a doubt, and exposition detracts from the simple force of the narrative, rather than adds to it. The last touch of art is added when the writer gives the comment of the centurion, the true significance of which is missed in every one of our English versions. He does not say what a Jew would have said, "This is the Son of God," nor even, "This is God's Son," but exactly what a heathen could only say under such circumstances, "This is a son of a god," or "a god's son"—i. e., a divine being. And the testimony is all the more striking, all the more convincing, coming from such a man in such form—it marks the conclusion to which Mark's whole narrative has been tending, and is its last word. For the brief account of the burial, and the finding of the empty tomb, with which the clearly genuine text of the gospel ends, add nothing to this thought; the evident purpose is to furnish the strongest possible confirmation of the claims of Jesus to divine power. It is the clincher of all that has been said. And there the gospel ends, as abruptly as it began. Having finished what he purposed to say, the writer adds no superfluous word. In scorn of mere literary finish, he does not trouble himself to compose a formal conclusion. That others tried to do for him, with the confusion of text that has resulted.

Mark has proved his thesis: Jesus is clearly shown by his words and works to be the Son of God, the Christ foretold by the prophets. His Sonship has consisted in his life of service, in his death of sacrifice. The second

gospel is, in a word, the historical justification of the doctrine of Christ's person set forth by Paul in the epistle to the Philippians—Son of God, equal in glory with the Father, he empties himself of the divine glory and power, takes upon himself the form of a servant and becomes obedient to death, even death of the cross.

THE HIGHER RATIONALISM.

BY HENRY C. MABIE, D. D., BOSTON, MASS.

"And he said unto them: 'Oh foolish men and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken! behooved it not the Christ to suffer these things and to enter into his glory?' ". Luke 24:25.

Dr. Alexander MacLaren has characterized the two disciples conversing together respecting the crucifixion on the way to Emmaus as "the thinkers" of the New Testament. Often as we have read Luke's account of their converse we have not been able to get away from Dr. MacLaren's characterization. These disciples were contemplating the strange events connected with the crucifixion of their great teacher, and as they pondered they began to exchange thoughts with each other. They philosophized respecting the phenomena of the previous days; they speculated about them, turning them over in the realm of their confused understanding. They "communed" indeed with each other "of all these things which had happened," for their perplexities were mutually shared and they sympathetically tried to help each other to some understanding of the outcome of their discipleship to the crucified. They made not, however, the least progress towards a solution of the mysteries which perplexed them. At best they reasoned only with their own hearts and with each other. They had not yet reached the point to which God, In Isaiah 1:18, invites, when he says: "Come now and let us *reason together*, saith the Lord of hosts." It is through reasoning *together with God* only that light falls upon the contemplation of things supra-mundane and heavenly. As it was, these two, commune together as best they might, could only question and debate; they could not solve.

All the time "their eyes were holden"—the eyes of mere intellection—"that they should not know him," the risen One. In their thought, their questioning together, they could only get so far, and there they paused. They found themselves in a blind alley; they could not even discern a "great iron gate" to their mental prison house. They confronted a dead wall, beyond which they could not pass. When Jesus, their unsuspected revealer, appeared and queried: "What communications are these that ye have one with another as ye walk?" we read: "And they stood still"—they came to a stand—"looking sad." This was not the pause of mere wonder at the question; there was in it also the dead halt which is always found in mere processes of rationalizing concerning the paradoxes of Christ's person and work. Men can get only so far and there they must come to a stand of human limitation so far as thought is concerned. The brain refuses to carry one further, and were this all that were in store for discipleship, it would be a pessimistic outcome indeed. Sadness of heart and darkness of countenance only would ensue. Such is the outcome of mere thinking, even so-called religious thinking, at its best. The brain mechanism cannot reach to God and Christ, to hope and salvation. "Canst thou by searching find out God?"

But these thinkers have yet other marks reminding us of the agnostic weakness of mere intellectualism. When their strange visitor seems so undisturbed by what was so confusing to the disciples, as if nothing unexpected had happened, they replied with amazement: "Dost thou alone sojourn in Jerusalem and not know the things which are come to pass there in these days." They chided him with his belated state of mind. These active, bereaved, debating minds, up-to-date respecting every phenomenon current, had been taking note of the times—they had pondered *zeitgeist*. Behind time, indeed, was the traveler who had come their way and was not informed and begloomed as they were by the phenomena

which had so staggered their understanding. These thinkers were "up to the times," while their companion in travel seemed hopelessly out of sympathy with the hour and its burden.

But observe again, these alert, troubled thinkers were also hopeless respecting the deepest problem of their theoretic life. "But we hoped that it was he who should redeem Israel." "It is all over now: he is dead and buried. Israel must toil on in hopeless thraldom to the hated Roman yoke, and all our prospects are engulfed in discouragement." It is ever so, if there be no light but that of reason on our path and destiny. The Jesus that these thinkers knew was indeed "a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people." Philosophy has always room for one more teacher if he has a theory for its contemplation, and will pay tribute to man's patronizing intellectual estimate of his message. A philosophy gets no further than to a prophet. It never sees a redeemer; only let Jesus be one of a series of intellectual and moral geniuses for the mind to admire and he can have a standing in its lyceum. In Rome he could be admitted to the Pantheon of the gods if only those gods be exaggerated men. Faith, however, must have a Savior and Lord, one standing in a class by himself; who can unveil himself to the soul's inner eye and cause the heart to burn with his own divine authentication. But thinking never finds him; it did not then, it cannot now.

There was a rumor, indeed—perhaps the thinkers would do well to mention it since they are telling the morning's news to thier wayside guest—that certain women of their company, who were early at the tomb, had reported a vision of angels, who said that the Christ was alive; some of the disciples themselves had gone to the tomb and found it empty. Beyond the existence of these rumors, however—rumors which sentimental women might entertain—strong-minded, thinking men could scarcely credit them as fact; and so they conclude

the reference to the hearsay of the hour by the self-satisfied comment, "but him they saw not."

Thus far in the narrative, we have the religious thinker—the type of religionist ever so much bepraised. But let us observe in what follows that we have also the divine estimate of all such in the plaintive reproof of Christ, "and he said unto them, O foolish men and slow of heart to believe," etc. Now be it observed, this is not the language of mere censure when the Master said, "O foolish men;" he did not employ a mere impatient epithet. He was truly characterizing the state of these men in the stage which they had reached. He virtually said: "O men without understanding, men destitute of the higher reason; O men abnormal and irrational concerning the higher wisdom." As thus merely speculating about the problem of the Christ and your relation to him, your language is that of unreason; you forget that there is a higher nature of things in the universe, even that grounded in "the lamb slain before the foundation of the world," and that under this order there is a higher propriety in events than you have yet discovered. "Behooved it not the Christ—such a one as was predicted from of old, such a one as the Messiah of Israel, such a one as had long been waited for as the desire of all nations—behooved it not that such a Christ should have suffered these things and to enter into his glory; and beginning from Moses and all the prophets he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself"—that is, the things concerning himself *on that subject,* the necessity of the dying and rising again of the world's Redeemer.

In the light of this narrative the higher rationalism of the universe is characterized by at least four things:

1. By the demonstration of the inadequacy of mere intellectualism. Christ becomes unveiled to men through the operation of other and deeper faculties than mere thought about him. The entire composite personality of man is involved. The conscience must act, the emo-

tions must move, the will yield, and the heart must burn in personal sympathy with one who is more than the Jesus of history and a prophet among prophets; even one who is yearned for as personal Redeemer and Lord.

2. By the discernment that redemption is God's deepest work, deeper than creation and prior to it. This world was created through Christ the Eternal Logos of the Divine Trinity, and hence man and his life are to be looked at from the view point of the second Adam rather than the first. Deep as is the fall, the purpose to redeem is deeper. Sin may crucify Jesus, may attempt to slay the Lord of Glory, but back of all sin's malice is God's voluntary atoning grace, which "lays down" life that it "may take it again," and become the soul's Savior and Master.

3. By honor placed on confiding fellowship, "and he made as though he would go further." This was not a deception practiced on the disciples; it was rather a coy test applied to see if they would invite him to closer relationship, or lose it. Had they let him go, they would have missed the full unveiling. Happily, the oncoming night made the companionship of the strange interpreter the more welcome, so they said: "Abide with us, for it is toward evening." His journey, therefore, sympathetically slackened with theirs, and he took them further into the secret of his presence and gave them compensation for all their weariness and heart-sickness. And thus he always does when invited into the inner sanctuary of the soul.

4. By an authentication to brokenness of spirit, he was "made known to them in the breaking of bread." When he and the disciples were all alone within the closed doors, and they were gazing reverently upon his face, they then became witness to one mystic act: he took a loaf, emblem of his own incarnate body; having sanctified it, he brake it, and in that breaking, symbolic of his own self-sacrifice and of theirs in a similar brokenness to his claims, he became fully known to them, and all the

agnosticism of the mere thinker passed into a full knowledge of experienced first-hand realization of who he was. True, he "vanished" out of their sight after such mystic disclosure, but in spirit he came again and again, and always does as often as we enthrone him. Then observe that in the new strength derived from so transcendant a vision the disciples were enabled to arise despite all the weariness of the day's march, and in superhuman vigor, strode all the way back to Jerusalem, to "rehearse the things they heard in the way." And so from similar insight into the person of the risen Christ shall we gain similar reinforcement of power for all the service to which he calls us.

THE BIBLE AND THE CHURCH OF THE EUPHRATES.

W. T. WHITLEY, M. A., LL. D.

Asia was the home of the chosen people; Asia was the scene of the Lord's birth, breeding, work and death; Asia was the birthplace of Christianity. The progress of the gospel to the west is better recorded, that progress has been more permanent and more interesting to us who profit by it. Yet we can piece together a story of its progress eastward for more than a millennium. The story crystallizes around the Bible, as it spread down the Euphrates to the Panjab, Cochin and Ceylon, up the Euphrates to Armenia, across the Asiatic deserts until it found a home at the capital of China.

Pilate set an inscription on the cross in Hebrew, and in Latin, and in Greek. From the Syrian hill-fort of Jerusalem, where the Field of Blood was called in the local tongue Akeldama, the news spread to Cæsarea, whose Latin name tells that it was an output of Italy, with Roman centurions; and before long fugitives were speaking to the Greeks at Antioch, preaching Jesus as Lord. This was, however, a cosmopolitan town, where a Latin governor was surrounded by a Greek body of citizens, planted in Syria. Once its kings had ruled as far as the Indus, and when the Romans defeated them and annexed this western province as far as the Euphrates, the rest of the kingdom fell under the rule of the Parthians, who built a new capital, Ctesiphon. Intercourse still continued, and the Syriac language in various dialects was spoken from the Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean. Indeed, just before Herod the Great was made king of the Romans, the Parthians had captured Jerusalem, and Antioch, and all Syria.

Jews were scattered all over the Parthian kingdom,

having been settled there by Tiglath-pileser and Nebuchadrezzar. They were well organized, with one center at Nehardea, where they accumulated their offerings for the temple, which they conveyed to Jerusalem at the great feasts, escorted by thousands of armed pilgrims. At one Pentecost we hear of Jews from Parthia, Media, Elam and Mesopotamia, who enjoyed the earliest proclamation of the gospel.

In the great cities of Babylon and Seleucia they formed a large fraction of the citizens, and such opportunities were offered them that two became satraps of the frontier province. They had a great taste for literature, and probably had some at least of their scriptures translated into Syriac. When the Romans crushed the Jewish insurrection in A. D. 70, Josephus wrote an account of the war for them in their own tongue, which he afterwards translated into Greek for circulation in the empire. Their zeal for making converts was great, and one princess came on pilgrimage to Jerusalem, to which place her body also was brought for burial.

It is not surprising, then, if we hear of the apostles Thomas and Thaddeus directing their attention to this well-prepared country, or if we hear of a king of Edessa lending a favorable ear to the new Jewish teaching. This town, lying between the Euphrates and Tigris, 200 miles northeast from Antioch, was destined to become an important Christian center, noted for the study, translation and circulation of the scriptures. Indeed, under its modern name of Urfah it has regained its old reputation, owing to the presence of an American mission.

Christian literature in the languages of these parts was begun by Matthew, who, like Josephus, wrote originally in his native tongue. We hear also of a "Gospel According to the Hebrews," which circulated in these parts, but is not yet rediscovered as a whole. It is about 170 when we find that other books had been translated, when Hegesippus of Syria and Melito of Sardis mention "the Syriac" in a way that implies a good collection. Then, too, a native

called Tatian returned home from Rome, where he had studied with Justin, had lectured and written, and had won some fame by his unsparing onslaught on the follies of idolatry. He composed the four gospels into a Syriac harmony, which rapidly became popular all down the valley to the Persian Gulf. The rediscovery of this in recent years, as the basis of a commentary by Ephrem, of a Latin harmony by Victor of Capua, of a Saxon harmony, and at length of an Arabic harmony, is one of the romances of Christian literature.

In 189 a deputation from the Indus invited the bishop of Alexandria to send them a missionary. He had at the head of the Christian school a converted Jew named Pantænus, and commissioned him to go and inspect the field. There he found Brahmans and other purely Hindu worshippers, of whom we learn through an account by Clement, his pupil and successor. But he was more interested in finding the old gospel according to Matthew in the original Aramaic or "Hebrew;" being himself of Jewish descent, he brought back a copy. But as this was the current tongue of the Christians on the Indus, and the Alexandrians spoke Greek or Coptic, he left them to the care of missionaries down the Euphrates from Edessa.

By degrees other books were translated into Syriac, and a good collection of Christian literatue grew up alongside the Jewish. About the time Pantænus being in India, stories of apostolic days were being written at Edessa, which contain many legends invented to bolster up celibacy, grafted on to a life of Thomas. A few facts seem fairly credible, being to some extent attested by accurate geography and by coins of A. D. 50. Thus we learn that Thomas visited the principality of Gondophar, a vassal of Parthia, reigning from Cabul over Afghanistan and the western Panjab; that he evangelized in another principality adjoining, and was martyred on the coast of Beluchistan; that his body was afterwards brought to Edessa.

In 227 the Parthian rule ended by a rising of the Persians, who for the next four centuries became the leading power in Western Asia. With their nationality revived also their old Zoroastrian religion, with its highly organized priesthood, and its body of sacred scriptures. Before long a movement gathered strength to restore the text of these holy books, and with the power of the state to crush all other religions. A similar attempt was made in the Roman empire by Decius, and again by Galerius, but it failed. A new emperor changed sides, and summoned new councillors in 325 to Nicea to adopt a new state religion. Not only Jacob of Nisibis attended this, but John of Persia and Greater India crossed the border to meet his brethren, and represent the Syriac churches.

While Constantine was patronizing Christians in his realm, Shahpur was persecuting them in Persia. The bishop at his capital of Ctesiphon dauntlessly opposed him, and another bishop in his sermons showed an unpatriotic leaning towards the freer land westwards. This man, Aphrahat, has left a fair number of writings, whence we can see that he was acquainted with the Gospel harmony, Acts, Paul's epistles, Hebrews and Clement's epistles to the Corinthians. These last books were then in great repute, and Eusebius had them copied and bound into some of the great Bibles he prepared for the churches of Constantinople. Ephrem, bishop of Edessa, commented on most of these books.

The Persian churches had planted Christianity along the Arabian coast. In 356 this district was visited by a party of missionaries, headed by a native of Socotra trained at Constantinople. He succeeded in converting the prince of the Himyar Arabs, who built churches at Aden, at Zaphar and near Muscat at the mouth of the Persian Gulf. But he was astonished to find Arabian churches with customs of their own, and expressed his grief that they sat when the gospel was read!

After seventy years of war, peace was made with Rome,

and compensation for losses was taken by dividing Armenia. Into this land both Greek and Persian missionaries entered. They found an old Armenian version made from the old Syriac, and a great deal of rivalry was evinced over revising this. The native literature is far too little known there, but it has lately yielded to explorers help in recovering the old gospel harmony, and in the Key of Truth is introducing us to a type of early Christians who developed ritual and faith on independent lines.

The Persian Christians were allowed to hold a synod in the capital and reorganize. Their primate was evidently a great diplomatist, for the king employed him on two embassies. But at Edessa on the frontier was a scholar who seized the opportunity of peace and toleration to translate "the New Testament out of the Greek into the Syriac, because of its variations, exactly as it was." At least from the days of Chrysostom the old Syriac Testament had included James, 1 Peter and 1 John; and the reviser did not handicap his work by adding more books. Rabbula, the translator, was perhaps fired by the example of Jerome, who had just done the same work by rendering into Latin for the west. The versions thus made almost simultaneously at Edessa and Bethlehem have won lasting fame; the one is known as the Peshitta, the other the Vulgate, both names meaning simply, the Common Version.

So soon and so universally did Rabbula's version become common, that the older versions almost perished, and have only come to light within sixty years in one or two damaged copies and in translations. He was prompted to work just in the fullness of time, for in a few years not only wars, but theological differences sprang up to rive Christians asunder. A treaty between Persia and Rome in 422 secured mutual toleration for Zoroastrians and Christians, but within a few years the councils at Ephesus and Chalcedon split Eastern Christendom into three parties. That which was strongest in Egypt and Armenia

was known as Monophysite or Jacobite; the State church of Constantinople was nicknamed by its opponents the Royal or Malkite; the Syrian churches were labelled by their enemies Nestorians, after a presbyter of Antioch who had become patriarch of Constantinople. Each of these parties was represented all round the Levant, some of each party spoke Syriac, all inherited Rabbula's Bible.

Now Theodoret of Cyrrhos, a bishop within the Roman empire, had been very busy collecting and suppressing the Harmony, endeared by two centuries' use; and Theodoret was suspected of leaning towards Nestorianism. So the Jacobites of Syria and Armenia were restive at the new Bible thrust on them by a heretic. They executed a third version, most atrociously literal, and about as badly fitted for real use as a schoolboy's crib to a classic in a word-for-word translation. Indeed it was so poor that when in 616 some of their dignitaries became acquainted with the merits of Origen's great Greek Bible, they revised their third into a fourth, adding the rest of the books familiar to us. Neither the one nor the other ever displaced Rabbula's Peshitta for general use; among scholars they might be studied alongside it, as Rotherham's Emphasized Bible is alongside the Revised Version; and to-day they are invaluable for restoring the true Greek text.

Meantime the Persian Christians, the great majority of those who spoke Syriac, formally adopted the doctrines of Nestorius in 484. This made the Malkites doubtful about a version used so largely by the Persian heretics. Justinian was fond of codifying, and he set scholars to work in Antioch to produce yet another Syriac version, in a dialect rather more southern than that of Edessa. Indeed so like is it to the language of the Jewish targums, or scripture paraphrases, that it has been called the Jerusalem Syriac. The Malkites who spoke Syriac did not care, however, to abandon Rabbula's version for Justinian's; or if the State compelled them, their scanty numbers never brought it into prominence.

Strange to say, the Peshitta had another rival in Persia, for a convert from Zoroastrianism produced another version; but it shared the fate of its congeners, and is only known to the curious. These three may be compared with the version of the American Bible Union, aiming at great literality, and influenced by the views of one denomination; with the great Bible of Henry VIII., never read outside the churches where it had a royal monopoly; with the private attempt of Hermann Heinfetter, a foreigner. No one of them ever dislodged the Peshitta from its hold on all the Syriac Christians, though its stronghold was in the kingdom of Persia.

About the time when Justinian ruled at Constantinople and Khosran at Ctesiphon, both Jews and Christians were stimulated to great activity in Persia. The Syrian college of the Jews in Babylon gathered together all their traditions, and published these in a species of Syriac, arranged as a commentary on an older work in late Hebrew which had been handed down orally for 350 years. The result is known as the Babylonian Talmud, a cyclopedia of traditional law, which has long been the text-book for Jewish scholars. Soon there arose a rebellion under a false Messiah, who was defeated and executed along with the official head of the Jews; then Khosran closed their schools, forbade their making proselytes, and generally persecuted them. Meantime they converted the Himyarite prince, who by similar means tried to stamp out Christianity. One tortured victim escaped, and with a half-burned gospel in his hand, appealed to Justinian for protection. He sent the Negus of Abyssinia across the sea, who re-established Christianity along the coasts.

The Persian Christians rose to their opportunity, under Silas patriarch 505-520. The Christians might reasonably hope that as they had persuaded Constantine to tolerate and then to establish their religion, so they might gain a similar victory in Persia. But first they must meet the Persians on their own ground and give them the Christian scriptures in their native language. So a Per-

sian version was produced, to win their rulers. Their hopes were so far justified that they converted and baptized a son of Khosran; but the enforcement of the law against perverting members of the Established Zoroastrian Church, if aimed at Jews, checked their home mission career.

Turning, then, to foreign fields, they organized a mission by sea down the gulf, and planted churches on the Malabar coast of India, in Ceylon, and near Madras, which were visited by an Alexandrian merchant in 522. At first they catered chiefly for their emigrant kinsmen, for the monuments still existing are only in Syriac and Persian; but there are signs of adaptation to native ideas in the decorations, especially the use of the peacock. It is remarkable that Solomon's traders had imported "ivory, apes and peacocks," and that the Tamil name for these birds came with them and stands in the Hebrew Bible. The Persian missionaries did not return the compliment and give the Tamils a native Bible, as they gave to the Persians.

In another direction they were more sensible. Armenia had a fresh wave of influence, and perhaps a fresh revision of its Bible. But a new power had been rising to the northward, the wandering Turks. Missionaries went among them, and presently a bishop was stationed at Samarcand. On they pushed across the deserts, and presently reached another empire, hardly known as yet to Persia, much less to Europe. Soon there was a bishop of China, and some of his missionaries returning carried with them the eggs of the silk worm hidden in a bamboo staff, so that by 551 even Constantinople heard of the triumphs of the cross in the empires of the Chinese, Turks and Persians, besides the plantations in Arabia and India.

In 593 the Chinese invented printing, many centuries in advance of the western world. A new dynasty arose that welded the rival states, established schools, instituted the present system of literary examinations as the

path to office, and gathered together the classics of the empire, causing a magnificent edition to be printed and published. The Syrian missionaries rose to the occasion, being reinforced by an opportune and accredited embassy. "Among the enlightened and holy men who arrived was the Most Virtuous Olopun from the country of Syria, bearing the sacred books. In the year A. D. 635 he arrived; the Emperor sent his prime minister, who conducted his guest into the interior. The sacred books were translated in the imperial library; the sovereign investigated the subject in his private apartments; when becoming impressed with the rectitude and truth of the religion, he gave special orders for its dissemination." This Chinese Bible was at first only the New Testament, for we hear of the 27 sacred books. No copy of it has survived, but many details remain of the success of the mission. We hear in the grandiloquent Chinese style that "every city was full of churches," many built at imperial expense; of another mission in 744; of natives becoming priests and holding high civil office. This information was inscribed in Chinese on a monument erected at the capital, Si-ngan, in A. D. 787, during the bishopric of Ning-shu. No longer was the Chinese church a foreign exotic; if the monument mentions the "Universal Patriarch the Lord John Joshua" of Baghdad, it names also the "Pope of China" and 61 Chinese priests. Above all, it tells of their having the scriptures in their own tongue.

But while Olopun was translating them, his mother church was passing under a new set of rulers. A second Khosran had captured Jerusalem and carried off as a trophy the supposed "precious and life-giving cross." This wounded his Christian subjects, and they helped dethrone him and restore the relic. But already in Arabia had arisen a prophet, who dallied awhile with Jews and Christians, but turned against both and almost exterminated the Jews from the peninsula. To the Christians, People of the Book, he gave life, security and toleration

on condition of tribute. On these terms the armies of Islam, under his successors, swept northward, bearing with them a new set of sacred scriptures, the Koran, claiming to supersede alike the Law and the Gospel. Soon Jerusalem and Antioch and Edessa and Ctesiphon owed allegiance to the Caliphs at Damascus, and the Universal Patriarch continued to enjoy protection and toleration from Moslems as from Zoroastrians. The Christians translated Aristotle, Euclid and Ptolemy for their new rulers, and so inaugurated the great era of art, science and letters that adorned the rule of the Saracens. When the Caliphs shifted to Baghdad, in 762, the patriarchs finally abandoned the ruins of Ctesiphon and moved to the capital. Every reader of the Arabian Nights knows how Aaron the Just reigned peacefully over the peoples of four books—the Koran, the Bible, the Law, the Avesta.

Yet many of these peoples exiled themselves, and all are represented along the Indian coast. The Zoroastrians of Bombay are still known by the name Parsus; that tells of their Persian origin. The Jews formed colonies at Malabar and even further eastward in China, where their descendants and their native converts still worship. And though the Christians were in high favor with the Caliphs, to whom they often served as doctors and secretaries, some preferred freedom to evangelize. Two great expeditions reinforced the missions on the Tamil coast and obtained charters of protection. Under these they at last built up a strong native church which still remains. But all these immigrants to India committed one mistake—they kept their books in their own tongue; little by little their descendants adopted the native tongues of the peoples with whom they mingled, and to-day their priests recite the liturgies in Persian and Hebrew and Syriac to people who hear without understanding. It seems strange that while Olopun was rendering the New Testament into Chinese, his brother missionaries to Travancore should be so supine; but perhaps the example of the Arabs checked them. For the

local king was converted to Islam, and that religion spread in his dominions.

Wherever the Arabs went, they took their Koran and would hear nothing of any version. All who sought for promotion in the state adopted at least their language if not their religion. And so from the Atlantic to the Indus there arose a new demand for Arabic Bibles, which was met chiefly in Alexandria and Jerusalem. Even in the days of Aaron the Just, the monks of Mar Saba translated the New Testament and Psalms from the Syriac, and fragments of their version yet remain. And in the days of William the Norman, a Christian priest whose name, Abu'l Faraj ibn et. Tayyib, shows what tongue he spoke, translated Tatian's old Harmony into Arabic.

Indeed, in 1056 the Patriarch of the Syrian church was the greatest Christian potentate. The Popes of Rome had been in deep disgrace for a dozen years; Benedict IX. had sold the office, and the weaker emperor had intervened to stop the scandals, deposing three Popes. Leo IX. had been captured by the Normans; he had quarreled with Michael of Constantinople, another "Universal Patriarch," so that the Latin church now cut itself off from, and was disowned by, the older Greek church. But the oldest of all, the Syro-Arabic church of Asia, was flourishing, though passing under a fourth set of rulers.

The Seljukian Turks, under Toghrul Bez, had just taken Baghdad, and were on their career to annex Jerusalem. Their methods were barbarous and hateful to the west, so that presently they provoked a crusade which for awhile placed a Norman count at Edessa. But the Syrian church had met and civilized the Parthians, the Persians and the Arabs, and had already done some work among the Turks and other barbarians of the northern desert, apparently making some versions of the Bible for them. And after the disturbances of their conquest and settlement, the Seljuks entered into all the traditions and civilization they had mastered, so that their last great king actually revived the ancient name and styled him-

self Kai-Khosran. They were Moslems, but their Christian subjects extended constantly, and we hear of five and twenty metropolitan archbishops reporting regularly from all northern Asia to their head on the Euphrates.

At length another invading horde came from out these wastes under Zingis Khan, and overwhelmed impartially every empire. First he annexed the five northern provinces of China, and in that campaign he destroyed the realm of Prester John, the Christian king of the Kara Kitai Tatars, much famed in legend. Then turning west and south, he marked his progress by the destruction of Bokhara, Samarcand, Balkh and Mero, till a week's massacre at Herat blotted out 1,600,000 people. That he ravaged into the heart of India and of Russia is of less concern to this story; but it is easy to understand that while he was so far favorable to Christianity that priests were welcome in his camp, yet when he devastated everything in Central Asia, Christianity there disappeared in the general wreck. The last years of the thirteenth century saw the Popes of Rome negotiating to obtain the submission of the remnants of the ancient Syrian church. And the daughter church of China became known to the west by a missionary from Nicholas IV. in 1288. He was surprised to find Christians already on the scene at the Mongol capital of Pekin or Kambalu, but declined to cooperate with them. However, he did good work in producing a Tatar New Testament and Psalms, which he was diligent to copy and circulate. But Tatar methods were unfavorable to literature. Longfellow has told us how—

Into the city of Kambalu
  Laden with treasure from afar,
  Baldacca and Kelat and Kandahar,
Rode the great Captain Alau.
And he stood before the Khan and said:
  "The enemies of my lord are dead;
Baldacca's Kalif, and he alone,
Rose in revolt against thy throne;
His body is dust o'er the desert blown."

The Chinese at length rose upon their oppressors and expelled them; and with their downfall ends our knowledge of the use of the Bible in these parts. When the Jesuits entered, some 250 years later, they did nothing to circulate the scriptures.

But overland crept the Russian power, with a Slavonic Bible; round the southern coast came Dutch and Danes and English; and another day dawned for the Far East. The Dutch printed a Formosan version of two gospels in 1661, and a Malay Testament in 1668; the Danes provided at last a Tamil Testament in 1715, and the Dutch a Sintalese in 1780. Carey broke new ground in 1801 with Bengali, and followed with many other Indian tongues; Marshman printed the first modern Chines Testament by 1814; Martyn translated into modern Arabic and Persian by 1816; Judson into Birmese next year. Meanwhile the Russians took a noble revenge on their old oppressors, by circulating Tatar and Mongol versions. In 1833 an American mission started for the Levant, centered to-day under Presbyterian auspices at Urumiah, the headquarters of the ancient Syrian church, and there has appeared the Syriac Bible in modern dress. The English Church Missionary Society is fostering the Syriac church in Travancore. And the English Baptists have reoccupied the old capital of Si-ngan and renewed the work that began so splendidly thirteen centuries ago.

Yet if to-day Asia is indebted for her Bible versions to the efforts of Russians and Protestants, it is well to recall the story of the great native Asiatic church, which reads its own Bible in a dialect closely akin to that spoken by our Lord, whose missionaries once spread from the Euphrates by land and sea, and whose motto for the Bible in relation to nearly every people it evangelized was, Ephphatha, Be Opened!

THE ESSENCE OF CHRISTIANITY.

BY EDWIN M. POTEAT, D.D., PRESIDENT OF FURMAN UNIVERSITY, GREENVILLE, S. C.

A reviewer of a recent book on Mohammedanism, writing in the London Spectator under the title, "The Variety of Islam," recalls the somewhat cynical remark "that there are always three forms of a religion—the form believed by the vulgar, the form professed by the learned, and the original form which nobody believes."

Now in raising the question, What are the essential elements of Christianity? we are at once confronted with the fact that there are numerous varieties of Christianity. The Christian Gospel has been pressed into a thousand different moulds, and the Christian Movement through history has gathered to itself accretions from every land, and from every people to whom it has come—thought-forms, primitive beliefs, superstitions, rites, etc. And these accretions have to a degree hybridised the Christian Gospel, and modified the Christian Movement more or less profoundly.

Our first task, therefore, is to determine what we mean by Christianity. In the past fifty years or so, great teachers have essayed to answer this question—Bauer, Ritschl, Pfleiderer, Matthew Arnold ,Harnack.

Bauer said Catholic Christianity is the result of a controversy between Peter and Paul—the one representing Judaism, the other Hellenism, and that the latter scored a victory in giving to the new faith its universal note and outlook.

Ritschl said, No; Catholic Christianity is not a compromise between antagonistic Jewish and Greek conceptions—since little trace of the Jewish elements is left. It is rather a stage in the development of the Greek conception of Christ's teachings and work.

Harnack, in his History of Dogma follows Ritschl, and goes further. He says: "The Christian dogma in its conception and in its development is the work of the Greek mind on the basis of the Gospel"—a thesis which Edwin Hatch has elaborated in his well-known book, "The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages on the Christian Church."* The Sermon on the Mount, says Dr. Hatch, belongs to a world of Syrian peasants; the Nicene Creed to a world of Greek philosophers, and when Christianity was transferred from a Semitic to a Greek soil, it underwent not merely formal modification, but material change, and "so it came to pass that post-apostolic Christianity in essential features differs from that of the apostolic age."

In his book, "What is Christianity?" Harnack says: "There are but two possibilities here: either the Gospel is in all respects identical with its earliest form, in which case it came with its time and has departed with it; or else it contains something which, under differing historical forms, is of permanent validity. The latter is the true view. The history of the church shows us in its very commencement that 'primitive Christianity' had to disappear in order that 'Christianity' might remain." (p. 13.)

Or again: "The Gospel did not come into the world as a statutory religion, and therefore none of the forms in which it assumed intellectual expression—not even the earliest—can be regarded as possessing a classical and permanent character." (pp. 190, 191.)

On the other hand, we find Mr. Matthew Arnold laboriously detaching the Aberglaube, the poetical extra-beliefs which, in his view, encumber Christianity, in order to show us the primitive Christian Message, and the real Jesus, since by his contention these alone have permanent validity.

While, again, you will see Pfleiderer maintaining that "the devolopment of Paulinism into Catholicism pro-

* The Hibbert Lectures, 1888.

ceeded by the organic method of purely inward modification," and "not by the mechanical method of external transactions and act of compromise."*

In the presence of diverse contentions like these, what is one to conclude? Can we be sure of the answer to our question—What is Christianity?

We are sure, at once, that it is not to be identified with any one of the present day sects or denominations which profess it. But is it set forth in the Athanasian or in the Apostles' Creed? Or must we go back to "primitive Christianity," the Christianity of Christ and his apostles, and the New Testament, for our definition? In that case our task of definition would require us to disentangle Christianity's essentials from its accidents, acquired through the centuries. These accidents we should find in the field of doctrine (theology), in the field of polity (where the influence of governments, and of the Mysteries, and of ancient ritual would have to be considered), and in the field of methods of propagandism.

The Essence of Christianity is something deeper, more interior and vital than all these—as is proved by the fact that Christianity persists through all manner of change in the statement of its doctrine, the ordering of its polity and in the methods of its propagandism. Moreover, the essence of Christianity is not to be identified with any one of the all but infinite varieties of Christian experience—since it underlies and conditions them all.

And here our question takes this form—What are the common elements in all these varieties of Christian Experience? What are the constants in the long and intricate calculus of Christian history? To answer such questions we should have to gather together all the forms in which Christianity has been held, whether by the learned or by the vulgar, all the creeds of Christendom, all types and varieties of Christian experience, all polities and methods, through which Christianity has expressed itself, and boil these down to an essence, and then set about de-

* Paulinism, II., p. 227.

scribing this essence in as brief and simple terms as possible.

Let me make haste to disclaim any intention of undertaking in this paper so elaborate and difficult a process as I have outlined. All I can do is merely to guess at what would be left if such an experiment were faithfully carried out.

In an article, "What the Battle Turns On,"* W. Robertson Nicoll recalls an eminent debate which was held by the Protestant Synod of France in a memorable meeting in 1872. The aged historian and statesman Guizot (he was 85 years of age at the time), obtained from M. Thiers, President of the Republic, "permission to convene a meeting where the limits of church membership should be decided." The meeting was held in the Temple of the Holy Spirit, and the question discussed was, What is and what is not the Christian Religion? Who are and who are not entitled to call themselves members of the Christian Church? Mr. Nicoll gives us quotations from some of the speeches. For example, Guizot said: "As for me, I am a Christian, and I know what my symbol is. There are men sitting by my side who do not accept the Christian religion. They have a sincere belief in God. I have been careful not to deny that these men have a religion. Let them form a deistical church. I shall be glad of it; but assuredly the difference is great between them and Christians."

The liberals in the assembly neither disguised nor evaded the issue. Their champion said: "In my eyes a man is a Christian who, though a sinner, has a joyous confidence in God." And he "denied that any specifically Christian belief was necessary to the Christian religion," and laid down limits of church association which would make room for every religiously-minded deist.

M. Bois, "the leader of the Orthodox party, met him squarely by moving that the Synod adopt as its confession, 'Salvation by faith in Jesus Christ, the only begot-

*British Weekly, Aug. 8, 1901.

ten Son of God, who died for our offenses and rose again for our justification'—and he described the difference between his opponents' creed and his own as the difference between two religions." In summing up the issue before the vote, M. Bois said: "The question which divides us is this: Is there or is there not—Yes or No—a supernatural revelation of God? Has God created, loved and saved us by his Son? If so, is this compatible with its contradictory? If Christianity is a supernatural revelation of God, it is not the supreme effort of the human reason. There are no shades or degrees here, the proposition is wholly true or wholly false." The vote stood 61 to 45 in favor of the orthodox declaration.

Not long ago a Baptist woman asked her pastor this question: "What do you consider to be the essential things in religion?" He answered with three words: "God, Morality, Immortality." Now, is it possible that he was attempting to get back of Christianity in this reply, and was conceiving of Christianity as the method by which these three had become realities in the life of mankind. If, on the other hand, Christianity was not in his thoughts, by such an answer, he was taking his stand with those philosophers—of whom there are not a few in our day—who "affirm that goodness is everything, that miracles are impossible, and that nothing in Jesus Christ has any importance except his moral teachings."

In that case Christianity itself is not essential—for well-nigh all other religions predicate God, Morality and Immortality—and we need not concern ourselves any further about the Essence of Christianity.

In "What is Christianity" (p. 68), Harnack says the whole Gospel of Jesus is expressed in the combination of these ideas—"God the Father, Providence, the position of men as God's children, the infinite value of the human soul." And at p. 70 he says: "To represent the Gospel as an ethical message is no depreciation of its value," and at p. 74 he says of the Beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount: "They contain his ethics and his religion,

united at the root, and freed from all external and particularistic elements." Earlier in the volume (p. 8), in a single striking sentence, he says: "The Christian religion is something simple and sublime; it means one thing and one thing only: eternal life in the midst of time, by the strength and under the eyes of God."

This, if I understand him, is the religion Harnack finds set forth in the message of Jesus, and in that message he finds nothing said as to how this religion is to be realized. It is only later, when he comes to the first Christian community that he finds Jesus recognized as Lord, the crucified and risen one (pp. 152, 164), and speaks of a living union with God through the Holy Spirit (pp. 153, 164), and of a moral life of brotherly fellowship, lived in expectation of the Lord's speedy return (pp. 153, 170-174).

Thus the religion of Jesus, and the religion of the first Christians wear different aspects in Harnack's presentation. And this could not have been unintentional on his part, for at p. 143 he says: "To contend that Jesus meant his whole message to be taken provisionally, and everything in it to receive a different interpretation after his death and resurrection * * * is a desperate supposition." And again: "The Gospel as Jesus proclaimed it, has to do with the Father only and not with the Son" (p. 144)—"God and the soul, the soul and its God" (p. 142). And this Gospel nowhere says that God's mercy is limited to Jesus' mission" (p. 145). "The sentence, 'I am the Son of God,' was not inserted in the Gospel by Jesus himself, and to put that sentence there side by side with others is to make an addition to the Gospel. But no one, he adds, "who accepts the Gospel, and tries to understand him who gave it to us, can fail to affirm that here the divine appeared in as pure a form as it can appear on earth, and to feel that for those who followed him Jesus was himself the strength of the Gospel" (p. 146).

After these quotations from his book, one cannot but

wonder: If Prof. Harnack, perhaps the most conspicuous teacher in Christendom, had five minutes in which the opportunity were given him to make a permanent impression on every human intelligence—*What would he say?*

Now, I suppose no one among us feels any such doubt about what Paul would say if he had the opportunity I have suggested. Nor can we be uncertain as to what use our Lord would make of such an opportunity.

We ourselves might hesitate long before submitting to such a test. We should wish to exclude from our statement everything local, particularistic, transient, and confine ourselves to Christianity's distictive message to mankind, and since the time of our opportunity is so short, we should wish to get at the essence of that message and make that known to men.

What, think you, would Paul say? Surely something like this:

"Christ died for our sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God; he was buried; the third day he rose again from the dead and was seen alive by many brethren, and by me also; in whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins, by means of his blood, and are justified from all those things from which we have not been able to justify ourselves before God, if so be that we believe in the mercy of God which is herein revealed. For by grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God. This salvation is made secure by Christ in us and certifies itself in a transformed, a Chrsit-like life; and it is consummated in a perfect and eternal fellowship with God in glory everlasting." (See 1 Cor. 15:3, 4; Acts 13:23-39; Rom. 5:6-11; Eph. 1:7f, 2:8; Col. 1:13f; Gal. 2:20, 5:22f; Rom. 8:18, 31-39.)

And Prof. Harnack agrees. He says "Paul did make Christ's death and resurrection the subject of a particular speculative idea, and, so to speak, reduced the whole of the Gospel to these events."

We have seen that, according to our author, our Lord did not mean that his message should be reinterpreted in the light of his death and resurrection. We here see the apostle Paul—probably the best Christian and (therefore) the best interpreter of Christianity that ever lived—doing precisely this thing; indeed going farther and denying any value to the message of his Master apart from his death and resurrection—saying, "If Christ hath not been raised, then is our preaching vain, your faith also vain—ye are yet in your sins." (1 Cor. 15:13f.)

But let us see what our Lord would say in our supposed opportunity, and inquire whether there is so wide a difference between him and his good servant Paul as the above statement of the case would imply.

If we take our records—including John's Gospel—at their face value, we are sure Jesus would say to every human soul: "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life." (John 3:16.)

If one objects that this is from the Fourth Gospel, and insists, as Harnack does (p. 19), that, independently of the first three Gospels, all that we know about Jesus' history and teachings "may be easily put on a small sheet of paper, so little does it come to;" and, in particular, that the Fourth Gospel "does not emanate or claim to emanate from John,"* and "cannot be taken as an historical authority in the ordinary meaning of the word," and that it is of value only as answering for us the question—where, indeed, it takes first rank—what vivid views of Jesus' person, what kind of light and warmth did the message of him produce? (p. 20.) If, I say, we are driven back into the Synoptic Gospels for answer to our inquiry, we shall there find our Lord (1) announcing a message of the kingdom of God, (2) presenting himself as the mediator of that kingdom, and (3) at length setting

* Per contra, see Prof. James Drummond's recent elaborate discussion of the Fourth Gospel.

forth his death and resurrection as the means by which his work of establishing the kingdom of God is effected. And the great imperative of John's Gospel, "The Son of Man *must* be lifted up," is repeated again and again on the pages of the Synoptists. If we could get at the elements of that necessity which was before the mind of Jesus when he said, so often in the last six months of his life on earth, "It is necessary for the Son of Man to suffer and be killed, and on the third day to be raised up" (Mat. 16:21), we should have the essence of Christianity, both as fact and as message; and we should know what to say to every soul of man.

With this statement of the case the alleged difference between Jesus and Paul vanishes. And from what they say we ought to be able to infer what are the essential Christian facts and truths.

These are:

(1) God is Love.

(2) Men are perishing in their sins.

(3) Jesus Christ came forth from God and came into the world to save sinners.

(4) The method of his saving work is threefold—viz.:

Truth (a message of the love of God and of the kingdom of God, illustrated in his life).

Death (in which he bears the sin of the world).

Resurrection (which is the attestation of his Saviorship).

(5) This salvation is appropriated by personal faith in the Savior.

(6) The virtues and graces of the Christian character are fruits; they grow out of the new life in the believer, which is Christ in us, who is also the hope of glory.

In a word, Christianity is distinguished from all other religions by being the Religion of Redemption. Nowhere else do we find One dying for the sins of the world; nowhere else do we find One risen from the dead to be the judge of souls (Acts 17:31); nowhere else do we find every believer brought into a direct and living and orig-

inal relation with God. Christianity conceived as a Fact, as a phenomenon in history, is Redemption. Christianity conceived as a Message to mankind is the Good News of that Redemption. Christianity conceived as an experience of the soul is the joy and strength of that redemption appropriated by faith. And the characteristic Christian events are three—the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, the Pentecost. These correspond to three facts of the believer's experience—

Christ's death for us.

Christ's reign over us.

Christ's residence in us.

Let no one object to this way of putting it, that "the doctrines of 'objective redemption' have been the occasion of grievous temptations in the history of the church, and for whole generations concealed the true meaning of religion" (Harnack, p. 183). Or again: "The fact of redemption could not permanently occupy the second place; it was too large. But when moved into the first place it threatened the very existence of the Gospel" (p. 185).

What he means, is this: If redemption is to be traced to Christ's person and work, everything would seem to depend upon a right understanding of this person, together with what he accomplished. The formation of a correct theory of and about Christ threatens to assume the position of chief importance" (pp. 183, 184). And he thinks that Paul's way of ordering "his religious conceptions, or the outcome of his speculative ideas, unmistakably exercised an influence in the wrong direction." It was under this influence that the Gospel was transformed into a Christology, and theories of redemption gathered upon and obscured the fact of redemption.

This caution is well; but the fact that justification by faith was abused and still is, does not invalidate the doctrine. The danger in our day lies in the opposite direction. What with Tolstoi and a host of others writing on the Teachings of Jesus, we are not likely to forget the

Sermon on the Mount. We are more likely to forget the unique significance of the death on the cross, and to 'spiritualize,' that is to say, vaporize, the resurrection.

And if I mistake not, Prof. Harnack is himself an illustration of this danger. For in the only obscure paragraph of his book he speaks of the conviction of the disciples that the Lord had really appeared after his death as merely a co-efficient, and as part of the outer covering, the bark, in which religion grows (p. 173).

Paul and Luke are surely not dealing in speculative ideas when they recount how Jesus showed himself alive after his passion, by many infallible proofs; and no pitch of enthusiasm in studying and applying the individual and social ethics of Jesus can take the place in the Christian system of the reconciling death and empty tomb.

The great Russian, coming late in life out of the vast mausoleum of Greek Catholicism, with its stifling odors, into the free air of the Synoptic Gospels, may nourish and preserve unspent to the end of his days his noble zeal for social well-being upon the message of Jesus; but younger men find that message not merely shorn of its power, but a clog and a burden when once they come to feel "Christ is not risen." Arthur Hugh Clough unveils for us the heart-break of that discovery—

> Ashes to ashes, dust to dust,
> As of the unjust, also of the just—
> Yea, of that just One, too!
> It is the one sad gospel that is true—
> Christ is not risen!—(Easter Day).

If Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus yonder in a garden hard by the place of the skull performed the last act in the drama of the life of Jesus of Nazareth, then are we of all men most miserable. For as there was no salvation for India in what Buddha said, and no salvation for Persia in what Zoroaster said, and no salvation for China in what Confucius said, and no salvation for Greece in what Socrates said, and no salvation for France

in what Illuminati said; so there is no salvation for us in what Jesus said.

He brought us Truth—the utter and ultimate truth—about God and man, and man and man; but he was not one of those reformers—doomed to disallusionment—who suppose that all people need is to be told the truth. And if you trace the course of his life you will find him at length offering himself. From repeating the message of the kingdom he advances to a more personal appeal: Come unto me, and I will give you rest. It is the appeal of experience to people who have rejected a testimony. It is autobiography displacing doctrine—saying: "If you will not believe the truth I proclaim, see and accept the truth I am."

And while not abating one jot of his perfect humility, he goes on—is obliged by the necessity of accomplishing his work to go on—to make the most astounding claims: "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father, and no one knoweth the Son save the Father" (as though he would say, "You who have seen and heard me on the streets of Capernaum—you think you know me, but how far short your conception falls!"); "neither doth any know the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him." Therefore it is he must say: "Come unto me."

And when men still refuse, he is driven past this personal appeal, and must now deal with that deep obliquity, that poisoned spring in the will, which alone explains hostility to truth, and indifference to love. Something more than truth, than truth in a person is needed.

In the first section of the book of Isaiah, the Savior is described as a Wonder of a Counsellor. In the second section it is discovered that good advice does not reach the seat of the malady of sin, and in chapter 53 we see the Savior described as bearing the sins, the victim of the transgressions of the people he seeks to save.

Similarly also in the Gospel story. The parable of the sower is followed by the parable of the grain of wheat.

The Teacher becomes the Good Shepherd, who lays down his life for the sheep. At last we see him overcome the sharpness of death, and, by his resurrection, open the kingdom of heaven to all believers.

Teacher, Savior, Risen Lord—it is in the strength and pity and glory of this threefold apprehension of him that Christianity presents Jesus Christ to mankind.

And at the expense of manifold iteration, it will never let us forget that the robes of the saints "are white because they have been washed in blood."

SOME CONTEMPORARIES OF MOSES.

BY J. HUNT COOKE, D. D.

Amongst the chief leaders of men Moses takes a prominent place. In literature he formed one of the grandest styles ever known, and which remained a model of fine composition for a thousand years. In religious thought he made an epoch, the second greatest known to mankind. As a ruler of men he has no superior. Where did he arise? What were the formative influences of his literary skill, his religious force, his statesmanlike ability? The inquiry is worth pursuing. We recognize in him a divine gift to the world. He was one in whom was found the Holy Spirit of God. But that does not destroy our desire to know if in early life he had any special surroundings out of which his greatness was evolved. Stephen, in the presence of a number of the scholars of his day, asserted "Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." Can we ascertain anything about that wisdom? It is not long since the time when we must have answered, No. But in the last few years in a marvelous way a very large amount of ancient Egyptian literature has been brought to light, and to some extent the power to read it recovered. That enables a different reply. Now, scattered in many museums are inscribed stelas and papyri. And on the walls of tombs and temples on the Nile extensive inscriptions have been copied. Very much of this has been read, and it has yielded no little information of the opinions prevalent in ancient days. In our inquiries into the evolution of human thought, especially on religion, this cannot but be important. And it ought to have some influence on Biblical criticism. The attempt has not been unknown of recent years to fix the date of a portion of scripture by a consideration of the evolution of religious thought. For example, it has been boldly asserted that

the books of the Old Testament ascribed to Moses could not have been written by him, because they reveal beliefs and ideas which were not evolved till a later date. The principle may be admitted, but the great consideration is a correct knowledge of the beliefs and ideas of the period. In a critical work recently published by an author of high reputation it is asserted that Job could not have been written before the age of Solomon, because of the expression, "gold of Ophir," not knowing that it is found in writings ages earlier than Moses. This writer further argues that it could not have been as ancient as generally imagined, because of the descriptions of the conditions of life and manners, ignorant, evidently, that many of these descriptions precisely agree with some recently discovered of much earlier date than Exodus. It is not, however, the object of this article to criticise critics, but to make known some of the large amount of literature of the Mosaic age which recent discoveries have brought to light, and which cannot but affect the views that are held of this great lawgiver and statesman and seer. Let us examine some of the monumental remains of the nineteenth dynasty, which is now almost universally believed to be the age in which Moses lived. Epitaphs, used aright, are of the very highest value. They may not be true of the person upon whose tomb they are inscribed, but they reveal the religious thought of the time.

Kanro.—In the Egyptian museum of the Louvre at Paris there is the monument of one of this name, who was of the court of Ramses II., the Pharaoh of the oppression. Hence Kanro was a contemporary and possibly an acquaintance of Moses. He is described as "a royal scribe, master of the mysteries of heaven, of earth and of hades." From the inscription we extract the following: "Hail, my Lord, passing through unending time, dwelling in eternity." "Lord of unending time, ruler of eternity." "Lord of lords, ruler of rulers, God of gods." "With thee righteousness is established before thy face, let me rejoice in righteousness and beauty."

"They who exist, amongst gods and men, are in thy hand. Thou appointest each his place in the unseen world; they pray to thee. Moving on millions of millions of years they arrive at thee. They who are in the womb have their faces towards thee." "The great, as well as the small, are with thee. They who live on earth approach thee in one place. Thou art their Lord. There is none beside thee." "What is and what is not depends on thee." Such sublime thought of God was held in the circle in which Kanro moved, the learned men of the age of Ramses, which was in the highest probability the station of Moses in his youth.

Ramses.—We shall be mistaken if we imagine that all the scribes of that generation held similar lofty views. There was diversity then as now. In the Louvre there is a fine palette of a scribe of the same age, of the name of Ramses (begotten of the sun). It has a long inscription and its possessor was evidently a religious man. It assuredly indicates a great respect for religion at that time, so that pious expressions were engraved on articles of daily use. In this there is little of the spiritual as with Kanro, but much of the ritual. Ramses speaks of offerings of oxen and geese, of libations of wine and milk, and all things beautiful and pure and gifts of flowers. He gives quite a list of gods whom he serves, and from whom he hopes to have "a good burial, a prolonged old age and a place among the glorified where his limbs may be regathered."

Beka.—On a stela, now in the museum of Turin, there is an epitaph to one Beka, of the same generation. He was of rank, a "superintendent of public graneries." This is interesting and points to a governmental department formed by Joseph. In the epitaph he boasts of being beloved by the monarch and of having risen by merit to his preferment. The religious views here expressed are of a philosophical cast. There is no mention of any worship of gods, yet acknowledgment of the Supreme. At the commencement he says: "I am just and

true, without malice, having set God in my heart and become accustomed to discern his will." "Now I have reached the city of those who are in eternity." "I have rejoiced to speak the truth, and know the glory of doing so on earth from the beginning to the tomb. My defense will stand. It will be said in that day when I arrive before the divine judges, experienced interpreters, punishers of sin, 'My soul is pure.'" There is no mention of Ra or of Osiris, but the anticipation of judgment by just assessors who know all. He speaks of affection to his parents, which appears to have been considered a great virtue in ancient Egypt. He concludes by commending others to be happy. "Pass your life in enjoyment until you rest in your tomb."

ANI.—One of the most precious treasures of the British Museum is the well-known Ani papyrus of the Book of the Dead. The marvelous collection of religious treatises to which that term has been given in modern times was complete before the age of Moses, and there is evidence that it was very well known in his time. It unmistakably teaches the doctrine of a future judgment, the resurrection of the body and an eternal life of blessedness for the righteous. In this copy there are a number of splendid colored illustrations. It was the product of a body of men with which we may well imagine Moses to have been associated, the scribes and high officers of the court of the great Pharaoh. Ani appears to have been a kind of Chancellor of the Exchequer and had charge of graneries. In a spirited colored picture at the commencement he is represented standing in an act of adoration, with hands uplifted as if in prayer. This suggests that in those days it was believed that piety was appropriate to a man of high rank. He wears a white robe with large loose sleeves, and an embroidered collar round his neck. He has a serious, thoughtful countenance, his face well shaven, and his hair dark and hanging in curls. His appearance is that of a thoughtful, wise, good man. His wife stands near; Tutu is her name. She is slim and

graceful, evidently a court beauty. She wears a plain white dress, with a green embroidered collar. Her black hair hangs in ringlets down to her waist and is crowned with a large lotus lily. She was one of the temple choir. There was evidently strong affection between the husband and wife, for they are represented as going hand in hand together to the judgment, through the many mysterious portals of the unseen world, and enjoying together the bliss of the future. The illustrations of this remarkable papyrus force the conviction that Ani and Tutu enjoyed a very refined life. And the position of Moses as a favorite of a royal princess and well educated in the learning of the age, and certainly of no ordinary intellectual power, or the capacity to rule amongst men, may have brought him into the friendship of this lady and gentleman before he felt it his duty to accept banishment rather than disavow his sympathy with the distressed Israelites.

Hunefer.—The papyrus of Hunefer in the British Museum is another fine specimen of the work of a school of scribes of the age of Moses. It brings further evidence of the lofty idea of the marriage relationship held by some in that age. Hunefer and his wife, Nasha, walk and worship side by side in life. His death fills her with poignant sorrow. They are happily united in the future state. Here is found a very fine hymn to Ra, which throws a light on the religious thought of the cultured men of that generation. It appears to be addressed to the Supreme Being, or to the personification of one of his attributes; or it may be simply a poetic mode of address to God, as we sing "Lead, kindly light" or "Sun of my soul." The fact is, there is sufficient to justify the conclusion that with many Egyptians of olden days no more was meant by Amon or Horus than we in a hymn to "Eternal light" or the "Sun of righteousness." It commences, "Thou art crowned King of gods, thou art Lord of heaven and Lord of earth, Creator of heights and depths, one God, evolved in time, Maker of earth, Creator of man, Maker of the river of the sky, Maker of the river

of Egypt, Maker of waters giving life to all therein; girding the mountains, evolving men and cattle, Maker of heaven and earth, traversing heaven with glad heart." It gives a very vivid picture of the judgment of the scales where Hunefer is led to see his heart weighed against the symbol of righteousness, or of law, in the presence of a retinue of judges. Hunefer was a royal scribe of the court of Leti I., hence possibly a little earlier than Moses, who might, however, have been at his funeral and was almost certainly acquainted with this grand hymn to divine light, which has not been found elsewhere.

Literature.—It was at one time thought that Moses was the father of literature, and that the Pentateuch was the oldest book extant. Now a very large number of works of a very varied character have been discovered of the age and of ages much earlier. There is a work on Mathematics, and a medical treatise. There are a number of works of fiction, some giving very entertaining stories. There are counsels for the guidance of life, such as the precepts of Ptah Hotep, a very remarkable book, full of common sense, showing a highly developed state of society. There are narratives of travel and adventure. The age of Moses was rich in poetry. There was the splendid epic of Pentaur. There was "The Book of Hades," an extraordinary conception of the journey of Ra, by night, through the region of darkness, meeting with the disembodied spirits awaiting judgment, not of men only, but of gods; showing a belief that beside human beings there were other creatures who lived and died and were judged for a future resurrection and were called by the word we translate gods. And there were minor or short poems, some of great beauty, such as the one called "The Harper's Lament," engraved on a tomb of the eighteenth dynasty. One of the most indubitable signs of the high mental culture of the age is found in the ruins of the majestic temples. In the breadth of the conception, in the beauty of the ornamentation they reveal the work of men of no ordinary power and taste.

Moses must have seen some of these, perhaps in their glory; and his imagination could not have been uninfluenced by their splendor. The Hall of Columes at Karnak, the Temple of Osiris at Abydos, the tomb of Leti at Thebes, and the wonderful Memorium at Gurnah were probably completed during the youth of Moses. To this day even the ruins stand amongst the wonders of the world, and cannot but be the work of a generation of very great taste and skill.

It was an age of great mental power and taste, and it was also, as we learn from the Pentateuch, and age of gross brutality and oppression. It was not wholly destitute of finer thinking. One more quotation from a poem in the Gizeh Museum by one who might have been an acquaintance of Moses: "Hymns to thee, framer of gods, supporter of heaven, founder of earth. Awake in strength, Lord of eternity, Maker of everlasting time, * * * Ruler of mankind. Hidden is his name from his offspring, that name which is Amon" (the concealed); Maker of men, sustaining them, forming their life, distinguishing the skin one from another; listening to the wretched in captivity; gracious of heart when one cries to Hun; delivering the fearful from the violent of heart, judging the poor and the oppressed, Lord of mercy greatly loving."

It is difficult to ascertain anything satisfactory with regard to the mental or religious condition of the Israelites with whom Moses came into contact. There is, however, one source of information which has not received the consideration it deserves. Some idea may be gained from the names men received. This is especially true with regard to ancient Egypt. Ramses means a child of the sun and indicates the prevalence of the sun worship of God under the name Ra. Akenaten, "Glory of the disc," suggests the existence of another form of sun worship which history informs us that king's mother introduced into Egypt. The name Merenptah indicates that that tyrant's mother desired that he should be the

beloved of Ptah, the creator. Now, applying this to the first chapter of the Book of Numbers, we come to the conclusion that the oppressed people, however much degenerated, had not entirely forgotten the God of their fathers. We may read: "And with you there shall be a man of every tribe; every one head of the house of his fathers. And these are the names of the men that shall stand with you: Of the tribe of Reuben, 'God the rock,' the son of 'Almighty the light.' Of Simeon, 'Peace of God,' the son of 'Rock of the Almighty.' Of Judah, 'Enchanter,' the son of 'People of Freedom.' Of Issachar, 'Gift of God,' the son of 'Little One.' Of Zebulon, 'God the Father,' the son of 'Strength.' Of the children of Joseph; of Ephraim, 'God hears,' the son of 'People of Renown.' Of Manassah, 'Reward of God,' the son of 'Redemption Rock.' Of Benjamin, 'Father, Judge,' the son of 'My Breaker.' Of Dan, 'Brother of Help,' the son of 'People of the Almighty.' Of Asher, 'Entreaty of God,' the son of 'Trouble.' Of Gad, 'God Increases,' the son of 'Knoledge of God.' Of Napthali, 'Brother of Calamity,' the son of 'Fountain.' "

This conclusion is unquestionable that whilst in almost every name of an Egyptian found in sepulchral records there is some mention of one of the false deities; in this list there is not a single reference to any, but many to Him the patriarchs worshiped. The twenty-four men whose names are here translated were born in Egypt just at the time when the chosen people were in their most depressed condition. So far there is a suggestion that they were free from contamination with the idolatries by which they were surrounded. This is also seen in such names as "People of Freedom," "People of Renown," "People of the Almighty." More than half the names indicate that their parents had thoughts of the true God. Eight have El, suggestive of The Mighty One; three have Shaddai, which some Jewish authorities assert indicates the tenderness, the motherhood in God. Some names indicate a Belief in prayer, and some that

He is the rewarder of those who seek Him. The term "Rock" is interesting, being one which Moses adopted and afterwards became a favorite. The name "Eliab" is especially noteworthy as indicating the grand, universal faith in the Fatherhood of God.

We have but touched the fringe of a consideration which deserves more attention than it has hitherto received. The modern deeply interesting study of the evolution of religions should be founded on fact, not on theory. The religious opinion of an age should be studied in the monuments of that age, not in a preconceived notion of what that opinion should have been on the theory of evolution. Recent discoveries in Egypt have brought to light facts which give an entirely different view to that previously held on the spiritual condition of the age of the Exodus, one which must considerably modify much that has been written about Moses. The stores of information of the thought and opinion of those days, recently brought to light, are as yet, it is admitted, but imperfectly understood. But they introduce us to a prebiblical literature of very great extent, of subtle thought and rare poetry, which fills us with astonishment at its wondrous and unexpected splendor.

THE RELATION OF THE BELIEVER TO CHRIST.

BY REV. C. E. W. DOBBS, D. D.

The relation between the believer and the Lord Jesus Christ is unique in religious thought. In all other religions there is an impassable gulf between the worshipper and the object worshipped. All ethnic gods are separate and apart from those who bow at their altars. There is nothing of fellowship between them. Christianity presents Christ as "himself man" (1 Tim. 2:5), though at the same time our Lord, with whom we may have fellowship. (1 John 1:3.) Dr. Franklin Johnson, in his admirable volume, "The Christian's Relation to Evolution," draws a sad picture of worship as it was conceived by the devotees of all ancient ethnic cults. In that worship there was never aught of loving fellowship. The altars were visited simply because the worshipper supposed the gods were angry because some ceremony had been neglected or performed imperfectly. Indeed, the character of the gods was such as to forbid either any lofty conception of worship, or desire for fellowship with them on the part of the worshipper. "To worship beings who would not have been permitted to live in any respectable circle of pagan society could not have been wholesome." Even the design of the worship was not infrequently debasing. On the other hand Christianity calls the soul to a worship pure and uplifting. That worship "contemplates a Being replete with all moral perfections, and reproduces his character in the soul, since we tend to become like any character whom we admire."

Our Lord appears in the Gospel as the infinitely pure and worthy object of the believer's faith and worship, and at the same time entering into so intimate relations with that believer as to awaken his yearning love and conscious spiritual communion. What a marvellous assurance of spiritual comradeship is that promise recorded

by John (14:23): "If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." The word here rendered "abode" (Μονή) occurs elsewhere only in verse 2 of this chapter, where it describes the "mansions"—the eternal abiding-places—the heavenly homes which Jesus promised to prepare for his disciples. There could scarcely be imagined an expression which should more clearly set forth the intimacy and blessedness of fellowship between the believer and his Lord.

This intimate relation is a matter of spiritual experience as well as promise. What sincere believer is there who has not felt the joy of this conscious fellowship? The expectation and experience of that fellowship is abundantly justified by the words of Jesus and his Spirit-guided apostles, as recorded in the New Testament. If Jesus had said no other word along this line, his assurance in John 15:15 might well cause the believer's heart to beat with exultant joy unknown to the devotee of any other faith. "No longer do I call you servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends." Thus he lifts the true disciple up into a conscious dignity which thrills the soul. The king calls the subject to his most secret council chamber! The lord and the servant meet on the level of associated friends! But even this gracious illustration fails to fully express the unique relation referred to above. Let us get further into this spiritual arcanum. A careful study of this peculiar relation, as set forth in the prepositions used to describe it, will reward the New Testament student. Every phase of that relation furnishes comfort and spiritual strength to the Christian.

Take, for example, those passages which describe the believer as "in (ἐν) Christ." These are so numerous as almost to forbid citation, lest in selecting from among them we forget the "embarrassment of riches" we have. In his memorable prayer for his disciples, offered up in that last passover chamber, Jesus asked the Father that

all believers in all time might be one in himself and the Father. (John 17:20, 21.) Whatever other truth may inhere in this prayer, there is certainly the thought of the believer's abiding in Christ. One reads with new interest the apostle's word: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." (Rom. 8:1). It has been well said that this is in some respects the most remarkable chapter in the New Testament, beginning with "no condemnation" and ending with "no separation." Perhaps in no other equal portion of scripture do we find so much of the fullness of redemption. Other passages readily suggest themselves. "Created in Christ Jesus unto good works." "Of him are ye in Christ Jesus." "And we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ." (Eph. 2:10; 1 Cor. 1:30; 1 John 5:20.)

The late Dr. A. J. Gordon, in his excellent little work, "In Christ," made very much of the phrase, declaring: "If we except those, 'God manifest in the flesh,' no words of scripture hold within themselves a deeper mystery than this simple formula of the Christian life, 'in Christ.'" He regarded them as "the key to the whole system of doctrinal mysteries." Through these two words, said he, "we get a profound insight into the divine method of salvation. God does not work upon the soul by itself; bringing to bear upon it, while yet in its alienation and isolation from him, such discipline as shall gradually render it fit to be reunited to him. He *begins* rather by reuniting it to himself, that through this union he may communicate to it that divine life and energy, without which all discipline were utterly futile. The method of grace is precisely the reverse of the method of legalism. The latter is holiness in order to union with God; the former, union with God in order to holiness."

Fundamental to this thought is the incarnation of the Eternal word. That is the primal basis of the possibility of this unique relation between the believer and Christ. Only because "the Word was made flesh" was it possible

for so gracious and glorious a relation to become real between the divine and the human. The supreme miracle of the Gospel was essential to this miracle of grace—this peculiar communion between the believer and his Lord. Christ became the Son of man that we might become the sons of God. Of course it is not overlooked that spiritual souls enjoyed spiritual fellowship with God before the angels sang the advent of the Christ. The point here urged pertains to that communion between the soul and the divine-human Savior as set forth in the Gospel. This fellowship of the mutual indwelling is unique. What does the phrase in question mean? Godet says that "Jesus Christ is the medium or sphere in which the believer lives and moves." Before faith the soul lives and moves in the sphere of the "evil one." "The whole world lieth in the evil one." (1 John 5:19.) The unregenerate soul is "in the evil one," and the evil one is in the soul. The indwelling principle is that of evil. Regeneration is a spiritual resurrection out of this evil one into the Christ. Born again, the soul lives in a new sphere. Thenceforth that soul is "in Christ." It has entered into the new experience, the spiritual realm in which the believer lives and moves and has his being. Thus regeneration is that "Emmanuel knot of union," as good old John Gill phrased it, which binds the believer in the indissoluble union with Christ. Indeed Paul uses an expression which goes beyond any language so far presented. In 1 Cor. 12:12 we read: "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body; so also is the Christ." The structure of the sentence would lead one to expect the words, "so also is the church." But instead we have a phrase which almost confounds our thought in setting forth the perfect oneness of our Lord and his church. No marvel that this blessed union is said to be indissoluble. "If," as another says, "we are joined to the Lord by a mere external bond only, the believer might well live in fear of being rent from him by the strain of temp-

tation. But so transcendently intimate is this relation that the Holy Spirit uses even Christ and the church as interchangeable terms * * * And will Christ permit his body to be dismembered?"

As intimated, this relation is the assurance of all spiritual blessings. "Of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." We read that the believer is "justified in Christ," "sanctified in Christ," "preserved in Christ," and "the salvation which is in Christ Jesus" is "with eternal glory." (Acts 13:39; 1 Cor. 1:2; Jude 1; 2 Tim. 2:10.) The chain of grace thus reaches in Christ from the eternity past to the heavenly glory of the ages to come. (Eph. 1:3-6; Rom. 8:28-30.)

The intimacy of this union is further apparent in the use of another preposition. Jesus spoke of "those little ones who believe in (εἰς) me." And Paul writes of "your faith in (εἰς) Christ." (Matt. 18:3; Col. 2-5.) So elsewhere. While ἐν expresses the state or condition in which the believer lives "in Christ," εἰς primarily sets forth the believer's entrance "into Christ." He "believes into Christ." Faith trusting with the heart in the redemptive grace of Christ brings the soul into the unique relation of spiritual fellowship or union with its Lord. This is symbolically expressed in baptism. The believer is "baptized into Christ." "In (ἐν) one Spirit were we all baptized into (εἰς) one body." (Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:27; 1 Cor. 12:13.) Whether the last passage refers to the baptism in water may be questioned, but in any event the substantial meaning is the same. Baptism is the symbol and emblem of the soul's entrance into Christ. "Baptism," says Gould, "is not merely an outward act in water; it has a spiritual side, the outward rite symbolizing an inward, spiritual reality. And just as the body is baptized in water, so the soul is baptized in the Spirit of God." The "Spirit" denotes the spiritual element in which the act is performed. It would seem that no evangelic mind or heart would see in bap-

tism other than this symbolic import. "How far," remarks Gordon, "we must ever keep from ascribing any saving efficacy to the water, or the ritual act of baptism, will appear when we consider how wonderfully framed the ordinance is for disclaiming all merit for the believer's obedience, in the very act of helping him to render that obedience. For not only is here a sign which is empty and worthless without the accompanying faith, but one which shows how empty that faith is without its object, Christ crucified and risen."

Still another preposition must be considered in this connection. The heart believes in and into Christ; it also "believes on (ἐπί) Christ." "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ." See among many others the following passages: Acts 16:31; 11:17; 9:42; Rom. 10:11; 1 Tim. 1:15; 1 Pet. 2:6. Here the thought is that of the believer's faith resting upon Christ; trusting him as the rock foundation of salvation. Baptism is also said to be "upon (ἐπί) the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts 2:38), evidently with reference to the primary significance of the rite as symbolizing the believer's resting on Christ's merits as the only Savior.

Before passing to another phase of the subject we should not overlook that suggestive phrase of the apostle, "praying at all seasons in the Spirit." (Eph. 6:18.) Taken in connection with the word of Jesus in John 16:23, the passage glows with new light. Jesus said: "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you." Of course the promise is to be interpreted within the limitations elsewhere expressed. All acceptable prayer must be the outgrowth of Spirit-filled minds and hearts. The indwelling Spirit will enable the believer to "abide in" Christ's "words," which is the Lord's own given condition of prevailing prayer. (John 15:7.) Asking in the name of Christ, in the spiritual consciousness of communion with his indwelling Spirit, is asking in the mind, and spirit, and will of Christ. Stier puts this thought thus: "We pray in the name, that is, actually

in the person of Christ, that is, as standing in his place through his preparatory and intercessory supplication, as if he came in and with us and himself prayed what we ask." Or, as Neander would express it: "He who prays in the name of Christ is moved and guided by the Spirit of Christ in prayer. He can ask for nothing but that which is in accordance with the will of God; can with assurance ask only that which the Spirit of Christ makes known to him in prayer as corresponding to the Father's will." Abiding in Christ, the believer receives the spirit of supplication, the blessing of "a mind clothed with inward prayer." Is not this the thought of the apostle in Rom. 8:26, 27? "For we know not how to pray as we ought; but the Spirit himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered." The unuttered yearnings of the heart are interpreted by the indwelling Spirit of Christ. And perhaps we have in this truth the key to the rather mysterious word which James uses of the prevailing prayer of Elijah (James 5:16): "The effectual fervent (ἐνεργουμένη) prayer of a righteous man availeth much." Does it not mean the prayer which is effectually inwrought by the Spirit? Compare 1 Cor. 12:11; Gal. 2:8; Eph. 3:20; Phil. 2:13; 1 Thess. 2:13.

Other prepositions remain to be noticed. They will be treated but briefly. "In Christ" the believer derives all strength for duty from him. Says Paul: "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me." What he was permitted to accomplish in his ministry was freely ascribed to Christ. "I labored more abundantly than they all; yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me." He would not "dare to speak of any things save those which Christ wrought through" (διὰ) him. His proudest boast was that he was Christ's servant, "whose I am and whom I serve." He would not even say that he "lived" any longer after being brought into vital union with Christ. "I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me." He realized to the fullest extent the meaning of his Lord's

own illustration: "I am the vine; ye are the branches; he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same beareth much fruit: for apart from me ye can do nothing." (Phil. 4:13; 1 Cor. 15:10; Rom. 15:18; Gal. 2:20; John 15:6.) So he humbly exclaimed: "I planted; Apollos watered; but God gave the increase." His conception of all Christian work was "labor in the Lord." "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain." The outgoing life of service for Christ was in his theology simply the activity of Christ through him.

The last cited passage (Phil. 1:21) leads to the last preposition to be noted. "In Christ"—"justified," "sanctified," "preserved," and "working"—the end of the believer is to be finally "with (σύν) Christ." In our Lord's intercessory prayer for his disciples he yearned for the ultimate glory of his own. "Father, I desire that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory." (John 17:24.) Did Paul have in mind that word of his Lord when he wrote Phil. 1:23? The veteran soldier of Christ was languishing in a Roman prison, and his soul longed for freedom. "I am in a strait betwixt the two, having the desire to depart and be with Christ; for it is very far better." To die was gain, because to his weary soul death would be but his departure for his heavenly home. Willing to remain on earth, yet longer serving the will of God, still his heart went out toward the better land, meanwhile shouting his triumphant faith: "Being always of good courage, and knowing that whilst we are at home in the body we are absent from the Lord (for we walk by faith, not by sight); we are of good courage, I say, and are willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be at home with the Lord." (2 Cor. 5:6-8.)

In the light of the passages through which we have come, the path of the believer in Christ shines ever brighter to the perfect day. To the believer "there will be no dark valley" intervening between this life of service and that life of eternal companionship with his Lord.

The heathen conception of the life journey was that of final descent into the shades, into darkness, into Hades. The Christian conception rather is that of ascending to the mountain peak of glory, from which the soul leaps into the very presence of Christ. Not into the shadows, but into the fadeless light our path tends. "With him in glory"—"forever with the Lord!"

SCHOLASTICISM; OR THE EVOLUTION OF THE LATIN THEOLOGY.

BY REV. W. R. L. SMITH, D. D., RICHMOND, VA.

Our day is the legatee of the Middle Ages. The unspent forces of the scholastic mind and spirit abide with us still. The schoolmen's learned subtleties, philosophic distinctions and theological terminologies project themselves into the twentieth century. Their idolatry of the syllogism, their stern joy in controversial battle, their dogmatic certainty, and fine scent for heresy, struck with decrepitude, come straggling into our time as seekers for a tomb. Explorations in this scholastic field are indispensable to one who would understand the development of systematic theology, and the commanding position still held by the mediæval theologians in Protestant religious thought.

The most significant activity of the Middle Ages is summed up in the word, "scholasticism." Broadly speaking, this wonderful movement of the human spirit ran from the year 1000 to 1400 A. D. It was the illuminating principle, the animating force, the monopolizing enterprise of that otherwise barren period of history. The word itself is non-committal; it reveals no inner characteristic. As contrasted with monasticism, whose aim was the cultivation of piety, scholasticism was an intellectual scientific movement, whose aim was the construction of a scheme of theology. A rationalized system of papal dogmas was the impossible task, laid on the church's intellectual Titans. The futile effort represented, at least, the triumph of spiritual over material forces, and the dominance of Christianity over all other human interests. Keener analysis, profounder speculation, or more magnificent generalization the human mind has never achieved. The builders of Latin theology were deeply

conscientious thinkers, whose work, though challenging obstinate dissent, must ever command the loftiest respect of men. Taking the dogmas as their material, and Aristotle's logic as their instrument, they framed a doctrinal system which holds Catholic loyalty to the present day. Their work attained the dignity of a synthetic view of the universe, embracing all the relations and interrelations of God, man and the world.

New ideas are stirring in the world just now, however, which are dangerously hostile to their doctrinal fabric. To-day, the scientific method is applied in the study of religious facts; literary and historical methods are applied in the study of scripture; the theory of evolution is applied to the whole of man's nature; belief in the immanence of God in nature and man increasingly prevails; the social interpretation of the teachings of Jesus steadily gains ground; added emphasis on love as the supreme quality in the divine character rings forth in ever clearer note; and likeness to Jesus is insisted on more and more as the adequate and only test of Christian discipleship. These conceptions were strangers to the scholastic mind, and their entrance into the arena of religious thought, means inevitable revision of theological systems, and the virtual undoing of the schoolmen's work.

A momentary glance at the politico-ecclesiastical situation will greatly aid us in this investigation. During this period the empire of Augustus, Constantine and Justinian was not regarded as a thing of the past, but as a vitally present reality. No one thought of it as ended by the political disasters of 476 A. D. The throne of Cæsar, by the sacred hand of the church, had been passed to the Frankish kings, and the new dominion was called the "Holy Roman Empire." Historically, it was a phantom, an unreality, but it was believed in most religiously as a fact. From the view-point of the Middle Ages, this was a vast Christian empire presided over by a civic head, called of God; and by a religious head, known as the vicar of

God. Latin Christianity cherished the idea of a universal monarchy of the world. It was right that it should be, and it was. The emperor and the Pope were equals, reigning for the good of men and the glory of God.

The empire and the church were two aspects of one society, which was destined to overspread the earth. The holy Roman Cæsar was the advocate and defender of the church against her foes; and the holy Roman Pontiff confirmed and hallowed Cæsar in his office, as lord of the world. Such were the ideals, political and spiritual that dominated and fascinated the minds of men from 1000 to 1400 A. D.

A demand gradually arose for a demonstration of the agreement between dogma and human reason. The church had never a doubt of the existence of such harmony. That there could be no contradiction between natural reason and revealed dogma was taken for granted. But as there were many apparent contradictions, it became necessary to reconcile them, to demonstrate the truth of dogma and to prove that ecclesiastical Christianity is a rational religion. The program, then, of scholasticism is to render dogma acceptable to reason.

Not in scepticism did this demand originate, but in unquestioning assent to the church's teaching. It was a sign of the progress of the life of humanity; an announcement that the human mind was pressing into light. Without a question respecting the reasonableness of dogma, or their ability to prove it, the scholastic doctors entered on their work.

GREEK THEOLOGY.

Unhappily during the centuries preceding this high endeavor, there had been in the church a fatal trend from the spirit to the letter, from the inward to the outward. The noble interpretations which Greek philosophy had given to spiritual realities had in the early Latin church declined to crude conceptions. Wholesome reaction sets in with the schoolmen's work, and the process is from

the letter to the spirit, from the outward to the inward aspects of religion. It is a curious fact, however, that these same scholastics were innocently unaware of a Greek interpretation of Christianity, by a people trained for ages in philosophical culture; and that this interpretation differed in every essential point from the faith of the Latin church. So completely had the knowledge of the Greek language and Christian history perished from the minds of men. It is needful that we tarry a moment to note the contrast that obtained between the Latin and Greek conceptions of fundamental truths at the beginning of the Middle Ages.

First: The cardinal doctrine of Latin Christianity was the transcendence of God and his isolation from the world, which is close akin to Deism. Against this view, the Greek affirmed the Immanence of God in nature and history.

Second: The Latin regarded the Incarnation as a remedy for the moral catastrophe which broke man's affiliation with God. The Greek deemed the Incarnation the completion and crown of the spiritual process which began in the creation of man.

Third: The Latin magnified the historical Christ, who figured a brief space in the world, then disappeared, leaving it bereaved of his presence. The Greek emphasized the spiritual or essential Christ, who has always been present in human souls, and became man in order to show the fullness of the Godhead bodily.

Fourth: The Latin held Revelation to be the final and definite communication of a message, a deposit in a book, guaranteed by tradition and handed down from age to age. The Greek maintained that Revelation is a continual process by which God is forever manifesting himself in and through human reason. Under this view the Hebrew prophets and the Greek philosophers are revealing agencies, fragmentary and incomplete, but Christ is the full-orbed splendor of the light of God, the incarnation of the divine reason.

Observe, that Transcendence and Immanence are the two terms into which all these particulars of variant opinion are compressible. Latin Christianity set itself to hold man separate from God and nature. If man should discover that this world is beautiful, it would cease to be the waste howling wilderness from which the church is to furnish deliverance. It was due to ignorance of all history, that the inferiority of these Latin conceptions, never once dawned on the minds of schoolmen. This ignorance was mainly traceable to Augustine, for he had vehemently insisted that an impassable moral chasm is fixed between the Christian and the pagan worlds. The fact is, the church of the Middle Ages had become interested in concealing the historical and human conditions of its own development, in order to promote faith in its divine character. That period had about as much knowledge of the human world and its history as the church permitted. Handicapped and dim-sighted, the enterprise groped its way to doom.

THE MATERIALS.

The Bible, the decretals of popes, the canons of councils and the writings of the early Fathers, were the materials out of which our theologians were to make a rational theology. To them, all these elements were included in the term "revelation." Now, primitive Christianity was not a system of thought, but a fact; it was not a series of dogmas, but a gospel. But in the stupendous growth of papal Christianity there had arisen a huge mass of doctrine, unsystematized and unharmonized. From Tertullian had come the formulated doctrine of the Trinity, and from Cyril, the doctrine of the two natures of Christ. But it was from her illustrious thinker, Augustine, that the church had derived her most effective and constructive beliefs. In the dogma of total depravity, he taught man's absolute moral debasement. In that fundamental fact his wonderful genius found warrant for the ecclesiastical structure of Romanism. Through the

church alone, can the grace of salvation be transmitted to the human wreckage. Man, he taught, lost his freedom in the first offense and then became the helpless slave of sin. From this premise, a remorseless logic led him to the concepts of God's unconditional all-powerful will, and election, which marked some souls to glory and others to despair. He then boldly assumed that the church is the kingdom of God, in which alone men can enjoy communion with Christ and become partakers of his grace through baptism and the Supper. This view of original sin became the central ecclesiastical dogma, and the vital support of the church's enormous pretensions. In the view of Augustine she was the divinely appointed and indispensable instrument of salvation. Under this teaching she came to regard herself as literally a member of the divine economy, and her priestly orders as a ladder leading down from heaven to earth. Thus gradually grew up the logical claim and consciousness of unconditional supremacy. A cunning book, written in the sixth century and falsely ascribed to Dionysius, Paul's convert in Athens, taught the divinity and worshipfulness of the church as the kingdom of God on earth. It is easy to see how, in this conception, its historical origin and development are utterly obscured. She seemed to be descended from heaven as an eternal ordinance, becoming visible in an earthly hierarchy. The fact is, the church was simply deified.

At last the time came when it was necessary to combine her scattered dogmas in one harmonious unity. Systematization was needful for convenience of teacher and learner, and that heresy might be tested and repressed. Not only system, but logical demostration and coherence were required that the demands of the human reason might be met. That the teachings of Augustine and the Fathers were an absolute expression of divine truth, and susceptible of rational explanation, the schoolmen had no doubt. This was their task, and such was the origin of the science of systematic theology as we have it to-day.

METHODS.

And now we turn to note the method employed, which was none other than that of deductive logic. The church was the only institution which survived the turbulent change from the old world to the new, and philosophy was the only surviving science. That science is now invoked. Like the philosophers of Greece, excepting Aristotle, the schoolmen were not seekers after facts. Investigation was not their function. The scientific spirit they had not, but they were masterful dialecticians. They were not set to discover what was true; that had already been determined by the church. Their work was simply to explain the dogma, demonstrate it and deduce the consequences. In the church, philosophy does not mean the pursuit of truth. The church has said Deus homo; the schoolman must answer, Cur deus homo? The church has said that the bread and the wine have been changed into the body and blood of our Lord. The schoolman does not ask: Is this true? but pliantly bends himself to the task of proving its rationality. The dogma must be made evident to the understanding. So, scholasticism might be defined as an effort for a rational theology under the control of an omnipotent church, with a view to the perpetuation of its authority and power.

The church has now committed itself to the fundamental maxim of the oneness and compatibility of philosophy and theology. They were declared to have the same contents, aims and interests. In explaining religion, philosophy explains itself, and in explaining itself it explains religion. This alliance of faith with science, of theology with philosophy, is the very essence of scholasticism. The church was conscious of the perils of appeal to reason, and she was not slow to set limits to reason's activity. Her fundamental principle, in this supreme constructive effort is absolute submission to authority. She is absolute and final judge of what God's will is and her teaching must be accepted without regard

to the remonstrances of reason or conscience. It has been strikingly and truly said that in the Catholic church "reason went into bankruptcy" when Augustine wrote: "I believe that I may know."

The practical result aimed at, in all these labors, was to make the will of the hierarchy supreme in the world. The premises for theological and philosophical reasoning were unalterably fixed. There was no inducement to the intellect to search for truth by scientific method. Deductive reasoning according to the laws of Aristotle's logic was the universal mode of procedure. Plainly, then, theology was merely the slave of the papacy, and philosophy was the slave of theology. A sovereign church had authorized philosophy, prescribed its field and demanded the construction of a consistent system out of discordant tenets. Faith and philosophy had been separate forces before the schoolman's task began, and when that task becomes an acknowledged failure, philosophy will resume her independent course. But now the two are united in holy wedlock by the authority of the papal church. Scholasticism will flourish while the alliance lasts, but will fall into hopeless decline when it is dissolved.

There was one undreamed of peril in this impressment of philosophy. In this servile labor there resulted a gradual strengthening of her faculties. She could not but chafe in this unnatural subordination. Remembering the freedom in which she wrought out the problems of Greek theology, she keenly resented a galling bondage in which her conclusions were predetermined. Samson-like, she will rise up some day and wreck the system she has been constrained to build. It never occurred to the schoolmen to seek the exact meaning of the Scriptures by the study of the original languages. In fact, the application of correct principles of exegesis would have exposed them to persecutions for heresy. For them the history of opinion could have no possible interest. Their active brains were content, under the rules of formal

logic, to draw out of each authoritative doctrine as many conclusions as possible, whether of any practical value or not. In their hands, theology often degenerated into idle hair-splittings, and even into gross irreverence. Scholosticism has no surer mark of identification to-day than this combination of logic and dogma. Philosophy's task was already performed by religion and her only function was simply to ground, develop and defend the dogmas scientifically. Now, the methods, natural to philosophy and theology, materially differ—the former being dependent on reason; the latter, on faith. What the latter asserts on the ground of revelation, the former insists on discovering in the light of reason and experience. Towards the end of the Middle Ages, philosophy, with increasing freedom, passed from the presentation and defense of doctrine to criticism and independence. Finally she abandoned the whole subject-matter of theology and turned to seek the wisdom of this world, as opposed to other-world wisdom. It was out of a sense of disgust with the dialectic subtleties and distinctions of system building that the order of the Mystics arose. These devout Catholics wearied of wire-drawn subtleties, and turned their attention to preaching, to the composition of devotional books and the duties of practical Christianity. They stood for personal piety and the rights of the individual soul, as against the despotic unity of the church, its tiresome dogmas and burdensome round of duties.

Thus far we have discovered the regnant ideas of the scholastic movement. *Transcendence* of God is its cardinal *theological* doctrine, as *total depravity* is its basal *ecclesiastical* doctrine. The *supreme task* is the classification of papal dogmas into a coherent and rational system. Its *dominant aim* or *purpose* is the increase or confirmation of the church's power. Its *materials* are scripture and tradition; its *method,* deductive logic;its *fundamental maxim* the oneness and compatibility of philosophy and theology; its *fundamental principle,* the servile

submission of reason to churchly authority. We have also seen that the schoolman's fitness for his work rested in his sincerity, loyalty and great abilities, while his disqualification lay in his exegetical incompetence and gross ignorance of history.

PROGRESS.

Early in the ninth century the learned Irish priest, John Scotus Erigena, did a pioneer work in this field. In him philosophy, not yet trained to subordination, dared to disport itself with its early Hellenic freedom. He rejected the doctrine of the Trinity, the union of two natures in Christ, predestination and the nascent dogma of transubstantiation, declaring his belief in universal salvation. The church promptly repudiated the work and condemned the author as a heretic.

Two centuries later, Anselm, a great Italian priest, assumed the task. His philosophy humbly took its servile place and function. He escaped Erigena's perils by alleging that the doctrines of God and Christ are not proper subjects of inquiry or doubt. His work was based in anthropology. Reaffirming Augustine's view of depravity, he showed the logical demand for the satisfaction of divine justice. Here was the triumphant answer to the question, Cur deus homo? This orthodox genius reconciled the jarring dogmas of Romanism to the satisfaction of hierarchial ambition. But the peace and satisfaction which his work brought to the church was not destined to endure. The fateful metaphysical controversy arose over Realism and Nominalism, dividing the schoolmen into two irreconcilable groups. The fury of this debate lasted two hundred years, issuing in the victory of Nominalism and the downfall of scholasticism. The scholastic Realist, adopting Plato's doctrine of ideas, affirmed the existence of an eternal, ideal, archetypal church, of which the papal church is the earthly counterpart. Such a view buttressed and sanctified their ecclesiastical pretension and usurpation.

The scholastic Nominalist denied the existence of the

eternal idea or prototype. Europe rang with the din of the logical battle, the church was distressed with controversial bitterness, and the mystics hungered for the bread of life. This speculative wrangle was not a mere war of words; it had a practical bearing on the explanation of doctrine. For instance, the Nominalist said, original sin is a mere phrase, the individual sin alone is real; the church is only a collection of individuals with no eternal prototype behind it. He contended that the supremacy of the church could not be advanced by appeal to absurd metaphysic, nor could it be harmed by adhesion to the judgment of sound reason. In this latter view they were gravely mistaken. This position was full of unconscious peril to papal assumption. It meant a coming down from the cloud-lands of mystery, a region always dear to the church; it meant scientific attention to facts and things as we meet them in the world. Without knowing it, the nominalistic theologians had committed themselves to Aristotle's principle of the investigation of the facts of life and nature. The scientific tendency of their principle was not favorable to Romanism and the Realists were quick to discover it.

About the year 1100 A. D. the brilliant French priest, Abelard, entered the lists—the most picturesque, independent, courageous and relentless of all the schoolmen. Logic was his idol. Augustine's aphorism, "I believe that I may know," he cast away as a bit of presumptuous credulity. "An incomprehensible God," he said, "is an impossible God." He essayed to heal the discords of theologic war. To the Nominalist he said, The idea or archetype is an entity and not merely a name; to the Realist he said, The idea or archetype does not exist apart from, but in the object. The hierarchy took alarm at the bold utterances of this Aristotelian athlete and set upon him instantly the brand of heresy. But free thought, while disturbing papal equanimity exceedingly, had now gained too much headway to be suppressed. Before 1200 A. D. the old conviction of the agreement of

reason and Catholic dogma began to be seriously shaken. Doubt was freely expressed as to the possibility of reducing the doctrines of the church to a rational system. Philosophy was constantly proving herself an unmanageable force, and the hour of the declaration of her independence was drawing near. Despite the church's opposition to it, Aristotle's influence among her scholars was steadily increasing. She denounced him as a heathen, and completed opprobrium by pointing to his popularity among the Mohammedans. In 1215 A. D. she put her official condemnation on his physics and metaphysics.

We come now to the strangest evolution ever performed by an infallible church. In less than eighty-five years from the condemnation of Aristotle he became the almost adored official philosophy of the papacy. This curiosity of theological history furnishes the basis of the Latin theology. Plato is discrowned and Aristotle is on the throne. Plato's doctrine of ideas had led some schoolmen towards pantheistic conceptions and to consequent scepticism in matters of dogma. Another result of the study of his writings was a tendency to dissatisfaction with things as they are and the awakening of desire for some ideal of beauty or perfection. Now, above all things, the church wanted an abiding satisfaction with conditions, theological and ecclesiastical, exactly as they were. For these reasons, despite the fact that he taught the Transcendence of God, Plato was abandoned.

Aristotle was found to teach Transcendence, but his special attraction lay in the fact that he stood for conservatism, avowing that things as they now exist, are divine. His idea of nature was that of a hierarchial system, of which God is base and summit. At once he became the ally of the church and the idol of schoolmen. He was called the forerunner of Christ in things natural, as was John the Baptist in things spiritual. He was philosophic Pope. He was made the standard of human reason, and independent thought outside of his views was forbidden. Under Platonic scholasticism there had been

comparative freedom of thought, but that inconvenience is now done away with and even the *task* of the schoolmen is changed. No longer is it to show the harmony of dogma with reason, but rather the harmony of dogma with Aristotle. Erigena, Aselm and Abelard were contradictory, but in Aristotle reason is found a disciplined power and is reduced to a fixed code.

Thomas Aquinas, an Italian priest, arose in the thirteenth century to occupy the central position in the history of scholasticism. He was its spirit and incarnation, and in him the great enterprise made its nearest approach to achievement. He construed all doctrine by the law of Aristotle's thought. The whole churchly system was rationalized by being strictly Aristotelianized. He looked at neither nature nor man nor God with his own eyes, but in the glass of Aristotelian formulas. His system was immortalized in Dante's "Divina Commedia," and to this day he holds supreme rank among Catholic theologians His theology was designed to be for human thought what the holy Roman empire was for the bodies of men, and what the holy Catholic Church was for the souls of men. It was to dismiss forever the human mind from labor and perplexity by vesting it with all ultimate truth.

The monumental work did not even enslave the thought of the church. Early in the fourteenth century Duns Scotus, an English priest, rose up to inflict on it a fatal breach. He taught with an extraordinay ability the freedom of the will and the doctrine of the "immaculate conception," both of which Aquinas denied. In open defiance of Aquinas he renounced all dependence on reason in matters of doctrine, alleging that revelation is the only source of knowledge. To guard against growing perils, Scotus boldly declared that philosophy is a science distinct from and independent of theology! This was a frank abandonment of scholasticism's fundamental maxim, which affirms the entire oneness and compatibility of reason and dogma. He withdrew doctrine after

doctrine from the possibility of rational proof, as, the existence of God, the incarnation, the immaculate conception, transubstantiation and immortality. He went further and avowed that dogma does not need to be accredited to reason, nor to be supported by it. In blind submission dogma must be accepted on the church's authority. Surely the earth caves beneath scholasticism's imposing edifice.

It remained for Occam, another English priest in the first half of the fourteenth century, to complete the severance of philosophy and theology and so compass the dissolution and downfall of scholasticism. No theological dogma, said he, is rationally demonstrable and theology cannot be made scientific. He spread consternation by showing the absurdly irrational consequences of some of the chief doctrines of the church, and the University of Paris, the intellectual capital of the Middle Ages, promptly put him under ban.

The end of scholasticism came from within and from without. After 1400 A. D. it was utterly divorced from the spirit of the age. It lasted long enough to show that the highest reason cannot defend the tenets of the Latin theology. The nominalistic logicians were its destroyers. Said they, Let's have done with reasoning on the high things of church dogma and institution. Let reason stand apart, while faith unquestioning accepts the creed. Thus philosophy was excluded into her own longed-for sphere of freedom, and the schoolmen's work became one of the most dismal failures in the history of the human mind. There was intellectual sublimity in the aim and in the efforts that seconded it. From the church's point of view, at least, her stupendous claims and incredible beliefs had received the amplest possible justification. But to the philosophic mind the effort at harmonizing papal dogma and human reason was a failure colossal, remediless and absolute.

THE SCIENTIFIC SPIRIT.

BY PROFESSOR FREDERICK W. MOORE, OF VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY.

This age has been well named the age of science. It is pervaded by the scientific spirit and dominated by scientific methods. In the world of business and pleasure science has become the handmaid of industry and art. In the ranks of thought, observation, experiment and induction have divided the field with Aristotelian logic and speculative philosophy. The age is intensely, passionately devoted to the acquisition of knowledge, incessantly engaged in the quest for new truth. Each year, we may almost mark how each month, each day, adds its increment to the stock of positive knowledge.

But the unknown has not yet been swallowed up in the known. We have not yet penetrated to the limits of the knowable. There is still before us a field, most assuredly vast, illimitable, infinite, which we cannot know experimentally. What we know of it we must know by faith.

Now faith is not knowledge, the positive knowledge of the scientific conception. Yet it would be preposterous, even in this age of science, to contend that it is not an indispensable substitute for it. Knowledge may be able to tell us the hard and tortuous path by which we have come thus far. But whither are we bound? What is our goal, our ideal, our aspiration, our hope? Since man was it has been his nature to yearn for an answer more satisfying than mere inference of the past could furnish. Each age and nation has had its explanation which it has formulated into a philosophy of life. There was the melancholy hopelessness of the Epicurean school, which had nothing more inspiring to teach than that man should indulge his commonest appetites for to-morrow he must die and cease to be. The Stoic taught that virtue was an end in itself; and thought for him, too, death ended all,

life was held to have attained to the sublimest heights of which it is capable and to have been worth living just in proportion as it had been virtuous. But neither Grecian culture nor Roman dominion could give permanence to these philosophies. They passed away, inherently insufficient to stand the test of time. But the Christian philosophy of life offered something more hopeful, more satisfying and lasting. It has gone on increasing and supplanting all others. Compare any number of devout professing believers in the world to-day with an equal number of others and see whether or not their Christian faith has given them an uplift and an outlook which the others have lacked.

Over and above what science can teach, the Christian philosophy of life is founded upon a belief in God, who is spirit and truth, who is the First Great Cause, who created the heavens and the earth, who made man in his own spiritual likeness and caused him to dwell upon the earth until the time come when "we shall be like him" and "shall see him as he is." Without this belief it would lack basis for those noblest aspiration by which it transforms human ideals and lifts men out of their lower selves even unto spiritual things. In a Christian community and in the presence of Christian readers it is surely not unreasonable to assume faith in God as the basis of further argument. If by singular chance there be one who must deny this assumption, let him be content to know that he is not expected to follow and give his consent to an argument that is based on an assumption which he denies. Let us address ourselves to that prevailing number who believe in God and to whom "Faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the proving (or test) of things not seen." It is "by faith we understand that the worlds have been framed by the word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which appear."

But not only is faith a substitute for knowledge, bridging the chasm from the known across the unknown to

God: Faith and knowledge are complementary. Where knowledge furnishes a solid foundation for reasoning in observation and experiment there is no need to substitute faith. But where knowledge fails there we must begin to raise a super-structure of faith from the finite up towards the infinite. As new truths, well attested, are acquired they are added upon the foundation of positive knowledge. Sometimes, unfortunately, the new truths do not harmonize with what in our ignorance, relying upon our faith, we had forecasted. A conflict is precipitated and antagonism is aroused between fact and faith. Fearing to precipitate such a struggle with the Roman Church, Copernicus long delayed the publication of his views, now universally accepted, regarding the solar system. In these latter days scientists no longer dread ecclesiastical anathema and have sometimes manifested presumptuous delight in challenging the faith of the faithful. Shall we, therefore, to avoid such experiences, desire that men should know less and believe more? Shall we not rather strive onward from knowledge unto knowledge until our faith in the existence of God is swallowed up in our knowledge of the Eternal One? Christians must logically believe as a deduction from their first promise—faith in God—and profoundly they do believe that the facts of God's universe are harmoniously consistent with his being and his character and his sublime purpose in creating men to dwell upon the earth. If at any time the facts within the limited sphere of our knowledge disturb us and shake our faith, let us hold them in reserve patiently until new facts, further tests, more light, a clarified faith shall set us at perfect ease again. Our faith is to us an ample assurance where knowledge fails and a sure test where opportunity for demonstration is lacking.

With these axioms to rely upon—faith in God, the Creator, and in the harmony existing between his character and the universe he has created—we are sustained and encouraged in the prosecution of the search for new

truth and more truth. For it is not sacrigelious to know nor impious to try to find out the ways of God with man. In Greek mythology it was. Study the great tragedy of Prometheus, bound eternally to the rock and suffering a living death with the vulture tearing so continually at his vitals, condemned because he gave useful knowledge to man; study and learn the littleness of pagan Zeus who would thus punish man's benefactor because, forsooth, such knowledge would breed in mortals contempt for God as not greater than themselves. That was the thought with which the serpent tempted Eve: "Ye shall be as God." It was also the thought to which Adam's expulsion from the garden was attributed. "Lest he ——— take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever." But who were more reverent than the Hebrew shepherds of old, the greatest of whom sang:

> "The heavens declare the glory of God;
> And the firmament showeth his handiwork."

But the attempt to substitute new truth for old faith is hazardous and those who will make it must be solemnly warned of the risk. The transition from the known to the unknown is precarious and the borderland between faith and knowledge is full of pitfalls.

The history of the progress of scientific discovery is a pathetic one. It is full of mistakes. It is a field strown with the wrecks of exploded theories and incorrect conclusions from inaccurate facts and mistaken assumptions. Copernicus, Galileo, Keppler, I know not what name to omit from the long list of those who, however great and worthy their scientific renown, have offered theories and put forword hypotheses which have long since been discarded as misleading, wrong and absurd. In astronomy, in physics, in chemistry, in medicine, in philosophy, in history, in economics, instance after instance arises. Books a generation old are unreliable because they contain so much that has been discarded. New ones must also be accepted with caution lest they contain error.

Yet out of much chaff many grains of truth may come. Who will say to the eager searcher for knowledge or declare, when discovered, that it is not worth the risk?

Considering these things there is more than a mere trace of temerity and no little presumption in the welcome which the world stands offering to new truth. The sudden apprehension of great ideas produces a mental shock. If, then, the ideas should prove wrong the shock would be an evil uncompensated. Even if the new ideas stand the test of time and gain complete acceptation, the shock caused by their promulgation may be serious.

Protestants delight to honor Erasmus who invited men to read the open Bible and to rely each upon his instructed intelligence in interpreting it. He was one of the earliest of the disciples of the new learning in England and North Germany. He turned eagerly to the study of Greek with the pious purpose of applying his knowledge to the study of the New Testament and of early church history in the original tongue. He printed an edition of the Greek New Testament, carefully comparing various manuscripts. He made a careful translation of his revised and amended Greek text into Latin. He boldly defended the points in which his translation differed from the Vulgate, which for centuries had been accepted as the authoritative version in the Roman Catholic Church, attacking especially those doctrines of that church which depended upon questionable renderings of the original Greek. Is it stange that this man created a sensation in his generation and greatly alarmed the devout who saw the idols of their faith ruthlessly destroyed by his iconoclasm. The Roman Church rallied and asserted its authority with a considerable degree of success. The Vulgate remains the authorized version of that church; but the open Bible even in the hands of the simple mulitudes has proven not a demoralizing but a conserving agency, a teacher of morality and righteousness, of piety, of faith in God, and of salvation through his Son.

At the same time that Erasmus and his contemporaries,

the choicest spirits of the New Learning in England and Germany, were opening the original text of the Bible to current scholarship, those who gave character and direction to the New Learning in Italy were discarding the Bible and Christianity. They were astonished at the broad humanity of the pagan writers with whose writings they were then for the first time becoming familiar. They were offended at the selfishness, the greed, the corruption and the hypocrisy which paraded under cover of the Roman Church. They stopped not to distinguish between the good and the bad in it; but they abandoned Christianity and ostentatiously espoused the philosophy of life and even the morals of papan days.

As the seventeenth century turned into the eighteenth great discoveries were made in natural science, such as those with which the name of Sir Isaac Newton and the Royal Society of England are associated: the law of gravitation, the law of contraction and expansion of bodies, and the discovery of the circulation of blood, among others. In France and in Germany, even more than in England, men's attention was turned to these things, and students in the university were drawn away from deductive theology and speculative philosophy to study and experiment in the fields of natural science. Trained in the experimental school of natural philosophy, Voltaire turned with no little kneenness of insight, sharpness of wit and vehemence of invective upon the church as it was in his time in France. Failing to realize the distinction between true religion and the hypocrisy of many who professed it, he attacked the church and religion and the piety of the faithful with equal irony and sarcasm. There was a multitude in those revolutionary times ready to take up the spirit of his attack, and France, within a generation, passed through such an "age of reason" that even a Robespiere revolted from it to the idea of a Supreme Being, and an irreligious Napoleon must needs lead his misguided people back into the fold of the Church of Rome.

The last half of the nineteenth century witnessed the scientific achievements of Darwin and Tyndall and Huxley, and the enunciation of the startling doctrine of evolution and new laws of matter and force. Infatuated with the principle of evolution which had been established by observation and tested by experiment in certain limited fields, the disciples of this school piled generalization upon generalization until from the sumit of Pelion on Ossa they would have made the mystery of God but a commonplace of science in their theory of the evolution of man from the protozoon. They analyzed man, nature and the universe into matter and force whose imminent nature would account for all phenomena natural, human and supernatural. How very many did they disturb and wreck in their faith!

But how now! The world of science has swung back from atheism to theism again. The men of science today know more of the complementary nature of matter and motion than Spencer did, of the nature of matter and the laws of force than Tyndall did, of the limitations of the principles of evolution than Darwin did. But as their ideas have broadened to take in these truths they have broadened also to see the greatness of the universe and the need of a God whom we must still know by faith in order to account for it.

It is, then, beyond question a fact of most serious import, that to be standing ever ready to receive new truth exposes us to many errors which are offered in the name of truth; and the promulgation of error and equally so the apprehension of great ideas may tear some away from their faith in God. Yet the results are sufficient to justify the risk, the experience is worth all that it costs.

We know not what new truths may be revealed to us, nor can we calculate what new visions, what new conception of God they will give us when they come. But whenever they do come, perhaps as a great revelation trying our powers of comprehension almost beyond limit, let it be

remembered that God's nature and truth is what it has been from the beginning. It is only our apprehension of it that is new. It is we who experience the shock—a shock that may be fatal to come—when we come to know him anew and more clearly as he is. It is his truth which will prevail. It is the truth about him which we seek. The form in which we have hitherto conceived it may be imperfect, incomplete, and subject to change.

This consideration is as reassuring and encouraging as it is important, for men were never busier nor more successful than they are now in eliciting the secrets of nature. Laboratories for research and experiment in physics, and chemistry, and biology abound and are filled with zealous investigators. Philosophers are occupied not with the antimonies of Kant or the pessimism of Schopenhauer, but with experimental philosophy and physiological psychology. Ethnology, anthropology and sociology are names which serve but to mark off certain groups of phenomena as the several fields within which specialists are carrying out the process of observation and induction. Archaeology is disclosing the monuments and records of civilization hitherto hardly suspected to exist. If we would study theology, we must proceed historically and comparatively. We must distinguish the theological conception of the Hebrews as they are recorded in the Mosaic books and as they grow through the distinctive periods that follow and are revolutionized and completed by the dawning of the new dispensation; while within the New Testament we must distinguish the history of Christ's life and ministry, the history of the apostolic times, the Epistles and the Revelation. All of these must be compared with the theology of the apocryphal books, of the church fathers, and of the reforming sects in turn. We may even go so far as to compare the Christian with the Mohammedan, the Buddhist, and the Confucian philosophy to find by contrast some new truth in it. Some have gone much further. They have subdivided Isaiah and analyzed the Hexateuch and

questioned the authorship of the Pauline epistles. Be patient. See what comes of it. They are carried away with the fascination of using their new instrument of research. If it were not so serious and sacred a matter we could be amused at the havoc which archaeology has made of some of their boasted conclusions. It is a fair question whether the tools of the craft are yet accurate and delicate enough or the methods certain enough to solve successfully all the problems which they are attempting. Still if there remain truths in the Bible which we have not yet appreciated fully, as there well may, it will be worth while to run some risk of rash and erroneous ideas (which we shall surely in time be able to throw off) for the sake of getting more spiritual insight into the Book of Books. This is the way the world has gained ground. It is the law of human progress natural, intellectual and spiritual. We try many means, risk many failures, make many mistakes if perchance we can hit upon the right means and move forward.

Now all of this vast process of varied research, experiment and induction is put to two well-defined uses in education. For one thing it discovers, tests and accumulates an increasing stock of facts and of truths, principles and laws based upon these facts. For another thing it supplies and determines the prevailing method of educational discipline. Every year the new theological student seeks to acquire facility in the languages in which the original scriptures were written; and then proceeds to study the law and the prophets, the gospels and the pastorals exegetically. Hereby he learns how to test the doctrines which are orthodox. Year by year successive classes in chemistry study the same elementary text book, hear the same lectures, perform the same exeperiments. They thus lay the foundations of a knowledge of chemistry. But this is after all not the chief purpose of the study. It is also and especially to train their minds and educate their faculties of observation, discernment and judgment. The student is trained to experiment, to

search, to observe, to classify and combine facts, to draw inferences from them directly, to verify the old and test the new. I know of no phrase which will so completely, clearly and comprehensively characterize modern education as to call it scientific. It proceeds almost exclusively along the lines of the scientific method. It is pervaded through and through with the scientific spirit.

Facts, facts, facts, more facts, only facts and inferences based upon the facts, verified and corrected by the observation of more facts still; and this is not in physics, mechanics, astronomy, geology, biology and chemistry only. The whole body of historians, economists, political scientists, philologists, and the students of comparative philosophy, literature and religion as well are all imbued with the scientific spirit and wedded to the scientific method. For better or for worse the scientific method prevails and you and I must take note of it and perfect ourselves in it and use its weapons skillfully if we are to accomplish anything for truth and for God, who is Spirit and Truth. Moreover, we must equip ourselves to teach the truths of the Bible to men who are accustomed to the scientific method of reasoning.

But if we are so dependent upon the scientific method and withal so ready and willing to make use of it, we must be warned of certain sources of rather serious danger connected with its use. To some of these attention has already been called. The shock that comes when startling new facts are announced which contradict those which have become fundamental to our accepted views and modes of thought; the announcement of so many alleged facts and incorrect inferences which have to be detected and discarded and meanwhile may mislead; the inordinate rashness with which difficult and delicate problems are attacked. But there are others which it is important to note in this connection.

Science should be broadening. But it sometimes becomes the reverse. There is now little danger that men will become atheistic because of any teachings of science

that would lead them to exclude God from their thinking; but there is some danger that absorption in their work, like the absorption of the merchant or the manufacturer in his business, will cause them to lose interest in the highest and spiritual phases of life. A man may become so occupied with the bacillus culture under his microscope and the wonderful things it may teach him about the processes of life that he will forget that the sun shines, that righteousness rules and that God is in his heavens. This is a busy world and men boast of their engrossment in its affairs. Those who are in danger of becoming slaves to their special business need something, some one, to arouse them from their preoccupation, to call them back to freedom, to stimulate them to interest in the things of the Spirit.

New truths will yet be discovered. No doubt some of them will be quite as startling as any yet announced. What shall be our attitude towards them. Among all the seekers in whose words shall we have confidence and when shall we confess ourselves convinced? Not very many years ago the old theory of light gave way to a new one—the wave theory which represents that light, sound, heat, electricity, the unknown X-ray and other rays are produced by wave-like motions of different character in various media, principally in the air and in the ether. However important it might be thought for us to know which of these theories is correct, since both cannot be, it was of no particular antecedent consequence which is the right one. The change from the old to the new produced no martyrs in science and no disturbing shock to our intellectual balance. Darwin's theory of the "descent of man" did both. The martyrdom, though never bloody, has now ceased and our intellectual equilibrium has been fully recovered. His theory of the origin of the race still remains an insufficiently verified hypothesis to most people, perhaps. Yet the general law of evolution stands. It has been so thoroughly verified in so many lesser fields that it has become almost a conventional form of

speech and mode of thought which we use in argument both by example and analogy. Now few of us are qualified to discover or to test at first hand the facts of natural science. In proportion as we have confidence in the character and skill of those who are, we must accept the facts they demonstrate. But there will be differences among us. Some will still doubt in spite of tests that satisfy others, demanding more exacting ones, and will be slower yet to accept all the inferences that may be drawn from the facts. Within reasonable limits this is not only their privilege as reasoning beings; in some instances it is also very wise to be slow to believe. The change, if change there must be, should come slowly, and those who would be too severely shocked by it must, if possible, be shielded.

But the most serious trouble of all is that the Bible itself becomes the mere subject matter of science. How dear to every Christian, not less to the humblest than to the greatest, are the hopes which he has built about the Bible as it has been taught him; and shall the truth of revelation and of experience be brought into question? it is asked. Now we cannot in this day and age prevent the application of scientific methods to the study of the Bible if we would, and we ought not to if we could. It must be recognized that from the time of Erasmus and Colet down the Bible has been subjected to examination in the scientific spirit; and doubtless will continue to be. It invites attack by what it is and purports to be. This is not a day of dogma and of authority. The fiat of pope or council is impotent to dictate the creed of the humblest Christian who studies the open Bible conscientiously with such knowledge and discernment as he can command. And certainly if this is true no flaming sign of warning "*Noli me tangere*" will suffice to keep the scientists off. We can command no man's assent to our views until he has first had opportunity to investigate the basis on which they rest. If we have confidence in our views of the Bible as Christians, as Protestants, as Baptists, we

must be ready to present them in such a form that they will command attention.

Again, the Bible invites attack because of the miracles it records. This is not an age given to belief in miracles. Scientists are more impressed by the demonstration of a new law than by the breach of an old. Former generations sought for signs. To the scientist God appears in the greatness of his works and in the marvelous regularity of the laws which they obey. He cannot conceive it to be in accord with God's being that his works should not always obey the same laws under the same circumstances. Whether he boasts of it as a mark of his broad mindedness and intelligence or you despise it as due to what you call the narrowing skeptical effect of his arbitrary dependence upon facts, it is certain that he misses the force which the people of other days got from the miracles; and it is equally certain that if you would reason with him about God you must recognize the limitations of his mind.

Miracles are a part of the accepted historical record both in Biblical and in secular history. The record at least testifies to the fact that the people of those days believed in miracles and honestly recorded what they believed they saw. Did they deceive themselves as our forefathers did who actually condemned innocent people alleging them to be witches, though we know now there never was such a thing as they thought a witch to be. Possibly so in some cases. But in others a more plausible explanation can be found in a law now known, but which was unknown and unrecognized by the observers, who, accordingly, reported and believed in the occurrence of the event contrary to natural law. Sometimes the scientist to vindicate the rule of law must still have recourse to the theory that they are in accord with law, but some law which we do not yet understand. The reproduction of life is something we do not yet understand. What a miraculous thing it would be to us if it were not so common. But if these do not suffice? Let us have

patience and confidence. No man may refuse to believe a thing because it is supported by evidence which he does not accept if there can be adduced other evidences in support of it which he does believe. Now the steadily accumulating mass of positive knowledge about spiritual matters grows daily and is more and more convincing.

Finally to the scientist the Bible is a composite of the history, the literature and the philosophy of the Hebrew nation. As such it is subjected to the methods of treatment to which other histories, literatures and philosophies are subject. Though the Hebrew nation was not large, no more important nation has ever lived. Its history is remarkable, its literature grand, its philosophy the noblest in moral idea and religious conception. It was through this nation that God revealed himself to man. Still its conceptions of God were largely anthropomorphic, while we would seek the Spirit behind the form. Its circumstances and institutions were so different from ours that in not a few cases the principle must be abstracted from the context and then applied to modern circumstances and modern institutions. We of this day do not need to be commanded not to put Baalam and Ashtaroth before Jehovah, but we need to be warned as to the first commandment against letting avarice and lust drive out him who is Spirit and Truth from our hearts. All of this, to the scientist, is so much the more reason why its records should be studied with the best means it is in his power to apply. It never would occur to him that its sacredness was a reason why it should not be touched. To the scientist these records are both history and revelation, a history and a literature and a philosophy most extraordinary because of the religion which is revealed in them.

In these later years the scientific interpretation of the Bible is causing more trouble than the scientific study of nature to find out her laws. The results do not seem to have been so serious as was anticipated and the alarm is somewhat subsiding. Yet there is need of wise caution

in guiding a movement that reflects the spirit of the times. Let Christian men who recognize their faith in God believe themselves well endowed with conservatism of judgment, openness of mind and spirituality of thought take it upon themselves to prosecute these studies. In their hands the hazards will be reduced to the minimum. Startling results must be made public with extreme caution. New truths—when they are sufficiently verified—must be so put forth as to be helpful to those who can use them and yet so as not to disturb too seriously the faith of others.

There is nothing inherently and necessarily destructive to science; rather, its results ought to be constructive, upbuilding. The scientific spirit is entirely neutral. In itself it is neither good nor bad. It is not necessarily and inevitably materialistic, atheistic, ignoble or unspiritual. It may be used to produce results of these sorts; and on the other hand it may be used to produce diametrically opposite results. The scientific method predicts no end. It imputes no purpose to matter or to God. It is neither moral nor immoral. It is simply a method or process of reasoning, and as such is in the hands of the users much what they propose to make it. It has caused much alarm and has been fatal to more than one; but after all it has made us what we are—broader and stronger in the faith and seeking more earnestly to know the spiritualities of God than any previous generation. Are we not justified in appealing to Christian men to make themselves masters of it and to use it for God, for his church, and for dying souls?

At the outset we dismissed the atheist as one with whom we could not argue because he would not accept the premises on which we were agreed. Let us now recall him and consider his mental processes. He is a man that differs from us in that he does not believe in God and consequently does not believe in the harmony between God's being and his universe, nor does he believe in God's purposes for men. But he is a scientist in

method as we are. He will observe and experiment and draw conclusions as we do. The facts that he and we both verify we must both accept though we may not be able to draw the same conclusions from them. Beyond what positive knowledge can teach us both, could we consent to give up our faith in the eternal purposes of God with men for his blank faithlessness? How much boarder, higher, nobler, grander is our outlook on life than his, as we strive onwards toward the realization of the most God-like powers that are in us. At the outset of our argument we assumed the Christian's faith in God. We hold to it at the end because it lifts us up and inspires us to hope and work for better things to come.

BOOK REVIEWS.

I. PHILOSOPHY.

The Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers. The Gifford Lectures delivered in the University of Glasgow in Sessions 1900-1 and 1901-2.

By Edward Caird, LL. D., D. C. L,, D. Litt., Master of Balliol College, Oxford. Late Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow. Two volumes, 12 mo., pp. xvii 382 and xi 377. Glasgow James MacLehose & Sons. 1904. Price $4.25.

The new Master of Balliol has fully sustained, perhaps somewhat enhanced, his reputation as a scholar, as a profound Christian philosopher, and as a most lucid expositor of the philosophical thought of the past, gained by his well-known books on "The Critical Philosophy of Immanuel Kant," "The Evolution of Religion," "The Social Philosophy and Religion of Comte," etc., and he has put students of the history of early Christian life and thought under renewed obligations, by the publication of his Gifford Lectures, almost wholly rewritten and considerably expanded. The author has wisely elected to confine his attention mainly to the great elemental Greek thinkers, such as Plato, Aristotle, the chief representatives of the Stoical philosophy, and to Philo and Plotinus as representatives of the two chief phases of Neo-Platonism. The theological thinking of the Greek philosophers is so organically united with the logical, ethical and metaphysical aspects of their teaching that it would have been manifestly impracticable for the author to have left the latter out of account. In the earlier lectures, as a matter of fact, the distinctively religious or theological element cuts a small figure, as it does in the systems expounded. Of course the field traversed by the author is very far from being a fresh one and only a consciousness of ability to penetrate more deeply into the principles that underlie the thinking of

the great Greek philosophers, to discern more clearly the course of development and the ways and degrees in which the influence of Greek thought was brought to bear upon Christian life and thought, and to give to his readers in easily intelligible form a more adequate conception of the losses and gains that came to Christianity from Greek sources and of the significance of the great Christological controversies of the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries than can be found in other accessible works, would have justified him in making this addition to the literature of the subject.

The author's estimate of the importance of Greece, or, more correctly, of Greek-speaking thinkers, in relation to theology is well embodied in the following sentences: "We may fairly say that the beginning of theology is to be found in Greek philosophy; for it was in Greece that reflexion first became free, and at the same time systematic. It was in Greece that philosophy first organized itself as a relatively separate interest, over against the immediate practical interests of life. Philosophy, indeed, cannot detach itself from life; in so far as it does, it must be smitten with barrenness. Its office is to bring life to clear self-consciousness, and because Greek philosophy did this, it acquired and maintained a relative independence. And it is this that gives primary importance to its contribution to theology. * * * It was thought of Greece, which in this as in other departments, gave to the philosophical enquiries of Christendom a definite method and definite aim. It was from Greece that the fathers of the church borrowed the forms of thought, the fundamental conceptions of nature and human life; in short, all the general presuppositions which they brought to the interpretation of the Christian faith."

Dr. Caird's definition of theology is worthy of notice: "Theology is religion brought to self-consciousness. It is the reflective analysis of the consciousness of God in its distinctive form, and in its connection with all our

other consciousness of reality. In this technical sense the word Theology first appears in Aristotle, as a name for what was afterwards called Metaphysic, the science which seeks to discover and exhibit the fundamental principles of Being and Knowing, and which therefore finds its ultimate object in God." He goes on to say that, while Aristotle was the first to employ the word, "the thing itself already exists in its full development in Plato, who, for good or evil, is deeply imbued with the theological spirit, and might, indeed, justly be called the first systematic theologian. In other words, he is the first philosopher who grasped the idea that lies at the root of all religion, and made it the center of his whole view of the universe."

In the lecture on "The Precursors of Plato" Socrates is given due prominence. Xenophanes had taught that "there is one God, greatest of all gods and men, who is like to mortal creatures neither in form nor in mind," and Heraclitus had expressed a monotheistic conviction in the sentence, "The One remains, the many change and pass;" but neither had developed his monotheistic thought or made it fundamental to his ethical teaching. Socrates confined himself almost wholly to practical ethics and was "a philosopher by accident." The stress that he laid upon knowledge as indispensable to virtue, asserting as he did that it was better to do ill with knowledge than to do well without it, was essentially individualistic and unsocial and from the point of view of the politico-religious life and thought of his city-state "profoundly irreligious" (I.76).

Six lectures, covering one hundred and ninety pages, are devoted to the tracing of the development of the doctrines of Plato that have a more or less direct bearing upon religion and theology and to the criticism of various phases of his philosophy. Accepting the results of the higher criticism as to the order of the production of Plato's writings, he attempts to show how each successive religio-philosophical conception has grown out

of its predecessor. This is a far more feasible undertaking than would be the attempt to harmonize the teachings of his different works, as if all stood upon the same level and each represented his maturest thought. It is manifestly impracticable in a notice of this kind to follow the author through his well-sustained exposition and criticism. Particularly interesting is Lecture Ninth on "The Final Results of the Platonic Philosophy." To the last Plato seems not to have reached firm standing ground as regards the relation of the phenomenal to the ideal world. To quote the author (I.226): "There is in Plato a strange fluctuation, both of thought and feeling, in regard to the phenomenal world. Sometimes it is almost exalted to the ideal from which it is derived, and sometimes it is contemned as a phantom world of shadows which hardly redeems itself from non-existence. The phenomenal world of Plato is so far real and divine, as it is a reflexion of the divine intelligence; but it is undivine and unreal, because it is *only* a reflexion of it."

Plato falls very far short of a genuine theistic conception. His nearest approach thereto is in the idea of the Good, which is, according to Caird, "only a step removed from the idea of a supreme intelligence;" but he knows nothing of a personal God who consciously plans and creates the universe. He seeems to have been utterly unable to bridge the gulf between the world of ideas and the phenomenal world. He seems to have conceived of "the world in space and time" as "a sort of disrupted and distorted image of the intelligible world, in which the organic unity and eternal self-consistency of the ideal loses itself in dissonance and change." Far better would it have been to have substituted for this "abstract opposition of the ideal world and the world of space and time" "the conception that they are correlative factors in the one real world." "Thus he would have avoided the opposite dangers of an abstract monism and of an irreconcilable dualism. He would have conceived the intelligible reality, or the divine intelligence which is its

central principle, not as resting in itself, but as essentially self-revealing; and he would have treated the world in space and time as its necessary manifestation." This last sentence is a concise expression of Caird's own idealsm.

Plato makes a close approach to Christian conceptions when he calls the phenomenal world a "second god," "son," and "only begotten son." Whether he really believed that the phenomenal word is a living being with body and soul or was only allegorizing, the language used early attracted the attention of Christian students and greatly interested them.

Several lectures are devoted to Aristotle, and his teachings that have a religious or theological bearing are compared in considerable detail with those of Plato. Especially interesting is the author's comparison of Aristotle's teachings with those of Kant. Aristotle's conception of God comes considerably nearer to pure theism than that of Plato. Regarding contemplation as the highest exercise of the human mind, he reached the conviction that the life of the infinite and perfect God consists in endless contemplation, with himself as the sole object. "In him is life: for the activity of intelligence is life, and he is that activity * * * We speak of God, therefore, as a living being, perfect and eternal: for to him is ascribed a life which is continuous and eternal; or we might say, He is eternal life." While he regarded God as the first mover, the original cause of all existence, he finds it exceedingly hard to reconcile his idea of God as pure self-contemplation with creative activity and continuous putting forth of energy in maintaining and governing the creation. He seems to think of God's influence in the world not as a conscious putting forth of energy, but rather as the result of the world's loving and longing for him, the end to which all things move. His inability to conceive of God as acting in or on created things is the fundamental weakness of Aristotle's philosophy.

Nothing in these lectures is better than the author's exposition of Stoicism in its ethical and theological bearings and its influence on Christian life and thought. "The kernel or central meaning of the Stoic system lies in the combination of two ideas, which appear at once to be essentially opposed, and yet necessarily connected with each other. The *first* is the idea of the self-centered individuality of the particular things and beings that make up the universe, and above all of man as a selfconscious being. The *second* is the idea of the unity of the universe as a whole, as the realization of the one divine principle, which makes the individuality of all particular things and beings, and even the individuality of man himself, into its expressions and instruments. In the antithesis of these two ideas lies the whole interest of Stoicism." Stoicism prepared the way for Christianity by development of the sense of individualism and moral dignity and independence on the one hand and of a recognition of a citizenship of the world with the ignoring of all racial and other adventitious distinctions. Caird thinks it highly significant that of the two most important representatives of Stoicism, the one was a Roman emperor (Marcus Aurelius) and the other a slave (Epictetus). The remarkable indifference to earthly ambitions and pleasures among Stoics had much in common with primitive Christianity and prepared the way for later Christian asceticism.

The author gives us little that is fresh in his exposition of the philosophical and theological teachings of Philo, but adequately vindicates his importance as an intermediary between Greek philosophy and Christianity. Much more that will seem fresh to most readers will be found in the six lectures on Plotinus, the Neo-Platonic philosopher of the third Christian century. The author's estimate of Plotinus at the beginning of lecture twenty-second is worth quoting: "Plotinus is one of the greatest names in the history of philosophy, the classical representative of one of the main lines of human thought;

he is the Mystic *par excellence.* And what makes his Mysticism more important is that he presents it as the ultimate result of the whole development of Greek philosophy. Further, if we look to the development of thought after Plotinus, we shall see that it was mainly through him, and through St. Augustine as influenced by him, that Mysticism passed into Christian Theology and became an important element in the religion of the middle ages and of the modern world."

It would be interesting to reproduce here the substance of Caird's exposition and criticism of the philosophical and religious thought of this remarkable man, and especially of his very instructive comparison of Mysticism with Pantheism. Here more than elsewhere in the work the author gives us a satisfactory insight into his own idealistic system of philosophy in its application to Christian theology, which it would be easy to criticise. But the notice has reached its proper limit.

It may be remarked in conclusion that those who have given little attention to Greek philosophy in its relation to Christian life and thought will find in Caird's lectures a most lucid and interesting source of information; while those who have given most attention to the subject will find in his exposition and criticism many fresh interpretations and points of view that will make the reading pleasant and profitable.

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN.

Principles of Knowledge. With remarks on the nature of Reality.

By Rev. Johnson Estep Walter, Author of "The Perception of Space and Matter." Vol. 1, 1901, pp. 302. Vol. II, 1904, pp. 331. $2.00 each volume. Johnson & Penny. West Newton, Pa.

The official notice of this work is written with care and definite accuracy: "A discussion, by the *a posteriori* method, of the fundamental Principles of Knowledge, and defence of the primary positions of Dualistic Real-

ism. The work assumes that, since the idealistic diversion from Locke, led by Berkley and Hume, there has remained an unfilled space'' for an *a posteriori* dualistic theory of *a posteriori* dualistic epistemology and realism, and attempts to supply a satisfactory theory. A positive stand is taken * * * against what is deemed to be the greatest and most far-reaching philosophical error of the times—namely, the doctrine of Ideality of Space.'' Following the outline thus set forth, but in our own order, we remark:

1. The author is right in saying that there has ''remained an unfilled space'' for an *posteriori* daulistic epistemology since Berkeley and Hume. A good deal has been written on the subject from various standpoints. Many writers have assumed, as they have a right to do, the validity of human knowledge and have not sought to formulate any defense of the assumption. Others—very many—assume or affirm ''the relativity of knowledge,'' and to the justification of this attitude the whole agnostic temper of the past century has directly contributed, whatever the origin and phase of the agnosticism. That the agnostic theories of the relativity of knowledge, the phenomenal character of our concepts, has never hindered the progress of scientific investigation nor practical application of knowledge, not even hindered the metaphysician from proceeding to elaborate his systems which involve either validity of human knowledge or an indefinite, extensive and perfectly symmetrical order of phenomenal misrepresentation; all this is due to man's ultimate confidence in his consciousness and is proof of the subjective ideality of all theories that phenomenalize the universe and make man the creator of his categories.

2. That Berkeley and Hume are to be charged with the modern uncertainty in the realm of epistemology is only partially true and it is even less true that they originated and represent an ''idealistic diversion from Locke.'' Our author holds that ''their philosophy pro-

ceeds not from the principles, but the defects of Locke's; * * * and is therefore in relation to Locke's, rather a *post hoc* than a *propter hoc.*" Now, it is true that Berkely and Hume and others of that school represent a development of the defects of Locke's philosophy, but of defects as compared with truth and not as compared with the Lockeian principles. The author, as it seems to this reviewer, attributes too much to Locke and goes too far toward making him a standard.

3. "The doctrine of Ideality of Space" is too subtle and evasive a view to deserve condemnation as "the greatest and most far-reaching philosophical error of the times." This teaching is fundamental and fundamentally wrong, but it is practically too inapplicable to be so intensely disastrous as is here implied. History does not justify the prominence given the error.

4. But the main point is that the author "attempts to supply a satisfactory theory," and on the assumption that this must be done "by the *a posteriori* method." He lays the foundation for this in an extensive psychological criticism that is discriminating, incisive, and done in a remarkably clear style. His work is in four "Books;" I. Cognition of Mental States, and of Real Mind; II. Intellection, or the Great Constructive Processes of Knowledge; III. Cognition of the External—Matter, Space, Spirits; IV. The Extremes of Knowledge, including the Notions of Infinity and Perfection, Universality and Certainty of Knowledge.

Now all this were well enough were premises demonstrable or strictly axiomatic. But with all the elucidation and analysis, with all the clearness and courage of the argument it remains that intuitionalism is at the foundation of all our certainty and that belief in the validity of our consciousness is a presumption in all our knowing. Our author really comes to this in the end, but seems to conceal from himself that he does so.

The work is not a demonstration *a posteriori* of the reality of knowledge, but it is a strikingly lurid and con-

vincing confirmation of our confidence in our knowledge. Its psychology possibly takes too little account of the physiology of this subject under current methods of study and one would take issue with some positions. The argument is cogent, sustained and clear. Its very clearness makes its defects the more evident. One who wants to study epistemology should by all means make use of this work.

W. O. Carver.

II. THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Studies in the Teaching of Our Lord.

By Henry Barclay Swete, D. D., Litt. D. —— Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. Second Edition. London. Hodder & Stoughton. 1904.. Cloth, pp. 186. $1.00.

These studies are "reprinted with a few changes, chiefly verbal, from the *Expositor* of 1903." "The aim of the writer will be attained if any reader is led by these chapters to examine with greater interest the Master's words as they are reported in the Four Gospels."

The plan, scope, and, to some extent, the critical complexion of the work is indicated by the order and titles of the six chapters: "The Condition and General Character of the Teaching;" "The Teaching in the Marcan Tradition;" "The Non-Marcan Teaching in St. Matthew;" "The Teaching Peculiar to St. Luke;" "The Teaching in the Gospel of St. John;" "The Teaching Considered as a Whole."

We have here *multum in parvo*. Would that others—especially our German friends—were equally kind!

The author's starting point is given in this sentence: "The gospels reveal our Lord as exercising the office of Teacher under the conditions of human life, and they place the teaching in relation with human history."

The first chapter may be thus summarized. Christ takes his place among the rabbis, but the differences between him and other rabbis are accentuated and gathered up under training, method and authority. He ex-

tends the Old Testament conception of the kingdom of God (which is practically synonymous with kingdom of heaven) so that it covers things old and things new, and interprets it as a force working within man—an interpretation at once novel and disappointing to the Nationalists. In the use of the terms "Son of God" and "Son of Man" he proclaims himself as standing in a unique relation both to God and to men. He eagerly taught the multitude, but early gathered about him a chosen few whom he taught with differences in aim and methods with a view to their publishing it abroad later. The immediate and ultimate effects of this teaching are noted, as is also the fact that Jesus promised to continue teaching them through the Spirit.

Dr. Swete finds in the Marcan tradition "an order, a purpose, and a relative completeness which suggest that they are in fact fairly representative of the great times of our Lord's teaching in Galilee and during the last week at Jerusalem." And here also he finds four of the great characteristics of his teaching—its inwardness, practical direction, universality and authority. Nor does he raise any question about the early use of "Son of man" in chapter II., as some would do.

The non-Marcan material in Matthew is grouped under the Sermon on the Mount, chapter XI., and what is said about the Ecclesia and the World. The most satisfactory of these discussions is that of chapter XI. The general conclusion is that "the field of observation in St. Matthew is larger than in St. Mark; the range of subjects more varied, and the teaching itself more extended and less fragmentary." The four characteristics already noted in Mark are here, and "the same unique personality can be recognized in both." But Christ is seen in some new lights—as legislator, architect (building the church), a teacher of wider outlook, and, back of all this, as the only begotten Son. This last note is surely a striking one—that Christ teaches as the Eternal Son, and not simply as a man.

The special contributions of Luke are grouped under parables and epigramatic sayings, and deal not with the kingdom of God, but with the mystery of the personal life—an important point to bear in mind. The special aspects of Christ's teaching revealed in them is graciousness, not untempered by a just severity. "If in St. Matthew our Lord appears in the character of the Evangelist of the kingdom of God, and in St. Matthew as the Legislator of the kingdom, in St. Luke he reveals himself as the Physician, the Redeemer and the Supreme Master of mankind."

Dr. Swete regards the Fourth Gospel as "a unity which cannot be satisfactorily distributed between two authors," though Wendt's attempt may have done service in calling attention to the subsidiary character of the narrative to the discourses. This is the Gospel of the Teaching of Christ. The marked difference between the Johannean discourses and those of the Snoptists is explained by (1) the ability of John to assimilate the profounder teachings of the Master, and (2) the differences in the persons addressed—the cultured and responsible people who resorted to Solomon's Porch in the one case; the peasants, fishermen, toll-gatherers and motley crowd of Galilee in the other.

The subject-matter here is gathered under (a) self-revelation touching the mystery of his own person, mission and work; (b) a revelation of the mystery of the spiritual life which characterizes the subjects of the kingdom of God; and each is much fuller than in the Synoptists. The author is not afraid to say that "His ends justify the Evangelist's deduction that he is 'the only begotten Son,' and even 'God only-begotten.'" The strength of Dr. Swete's conviction here is shown in the following sentence: "It is not the Spirit of Christ which leads men to lower Christ's own estimate of his claims, or to minimize the terms of his self-revelation; and there is reason to fear that in proportion as such a tendency grows amongst us, there will be a falling off in the yield

of the fruit of the Spirit, which are the *raison d'être* of the Christian church." That feeling many have shared, though rarely has it been so well expressed.

The closing chapter enlarges upon the nature of the kingdom of God; calls attention to the striking fact that in the kingdom Christ himself is the King; insists on God's Fatherhood to all men, dormant though it be, till repentance comes; while equally insisting upon Christ's unique Sonship as involving his deity; regards the phrase, "Son of man," as representing "humanity both in its weakness and its potential glory;" treats the Cross not as "simply a foreseen consequence of his mission, but as a true and essential, perhaps the most essential, factor in its fulfillment;" declares that the general effect of the teaching respecting the Holy Spirit "is to place by the side of the Father and Son a third Divine Person, and the Eternal Phase of the One Divine Life;" and concludes with a summary of the teaching concerning the church, the needs of the individual, and future rewards and punishments. On the last solemn topic his remarks are eminently judicial.

The book grows on one with re-reading. It is a condensation of the results of much hard work, and eminently sane and balanced. His meaning is always perfectly clear. There is both quiet dogmatism and the restraint of candor. He is free in criticism, too free, occasionally, one feels, but he is orthodox in doctrine. The weakest parts of the discussion are those touching the church and the Sermon on the Mount. The analysis of the latter does not commend itself, and the views of the church furnish another illustration of the difficulty that Anglicans generally have in apprehending the New Testament teaching on that subject.

J. H. Farmer.

The Apostles of Our Lord.

By the Rev. J. G. Greenough, M. A., New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son 1904. 278 pp.

Mr. Greenough is one of the ablest English Baptist

ministers and is the author of "The Cross in Modern Life." This is not so pretentious a volume as Bruce's great work on "The Training of the Twelve," but it is a useful and timely discussion. The analysis is clear, the treatment is direct, and many apt and striking points are made. Any Bible student will enjoy it and be helped by it. The author is very modest in his remarks about the volume, but he has underrated a really fresh and wholesome contribution to a most important subject. There is sanity where it is easy to be speculative. All the essential parts about the apostles are presented in compact form and in a very readable style.

A. T. Robertson.

Die Hauptprobleme des Lebens Jesu.

Eine geschichtliche Untersuchung von Fritz Barth, Lic. theol. ordentt. Proffessor der Theologie an der Universität Bern. Zweite, umgearbeitete Auflage. Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, Gutersloh, Germany, 1903. To be had through Lemcke & Buechner, New York.

The original work appeared in 1899, but the new edition is welcome. The work is conservative from the continental standpoint, though he admits that Jesus did not rightly diagnose nervous diseases and was in error about demons, the Davidic origin of Psalm 110, and his own early return to the earth; yet he accepts the Messiahship of Jesus, his atoning death, and real resurrection. He accepts the early date of Mark and Luke and the Aranaic Matthew (by the apostle), and holds that the Greek Matthew is later. Barth accepts also the genuineness of John's Gospel. The book is reverential and not captious and is to be considered by earnest students of the life of Jesus who do not concede all that he does to negative criticism.

A. T. Robertson.

Das Marcusevangelium und seine Quellen.

Ein Beitrag zur Lösung der Urmarcusfrage. Lic. Rich. Ad Hoffmann Privatdocent in Königsberg, Germany. Königsberg, 1 Pr. Thomas und Oppermann (Ferd. Beyers Buchandlung). 1904. To be had also from Lemcke & Buechner, 11 East 17th Street, New York. Preis M. 16. 644 pp..

This is a careful and scholarly effort to solve the

Synoptic problem. The author rather apologizes for his seeming temerity in making a new attempt in this most difficult field of study. We cannot say that Mr. Hoffmann has attained certainty or even strong probability for his contention. He postulates two sources for the present Gospel of Mark—one an Aramaic original designed for the Syrian Christians, another a translation of this into Greek and modified to suit heathen Christians generally. Out of those two sources our present Mark has come. There is careful examination of the Gospel in support of this hypothesis, and Matthew and Luke are minutely discussed at every point of contact. But like all similar work, the result rests largely on subjective considerations and cannot be convincing. Still every worker on the criticism of the Synoptic Gospels and every critical student of Mark must take into account this exhaustive and conscientious discussion by Mr. Hoffmann of Königsberg.

A. T. Robertson.

Der Römerbrief, Eine Exegetische Studie.

Von D. Paul Feine, ord. Proffesor der ev. Theologie in Wien Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Goettingen, Germany. 1903. To be had from Lemcke & Buechner, 11 East 17th Street, New York. 159 pp.

Dr. Feine rightly says that the epistle to the Romans is not a compendium of Pauline teaching, but a real epistle with historical occasion and definite aim, though it is in fact the fullest presentation of Paul's Gospel that we have. This is one of the epistles that even Baur acknowledged to be genuine, and here certainly we have a definite picture of an original Christian community. The problem of the epistle lies in the double character running through it. It seems partly to Gentiles and partly to Jews. This book of Feine discusses the various solutions of the question by Zahn, Spitta, Pfleiderer, Weiss, Weizsäcker, Jülicher, and holds to the heathen Christian character of the epistle, though it proclaims a gospel that is friendly to the Jews. He opposes Spitta's idea that chapter 16 was addressed to Ephesus and not Rome.

A. T. Robertson.

Outlines of the Life of Christ.

By W. Sanday, D.D., LL.D., Litt. D. Charles Scribner's Sons. New York. 1905. Price $1.25 net. 251 pp.

This volume is the reproduction and slight modification of Dr. Sanday's famous article on Jesus Christ in the Hastings Dictionary of the Bible. The public is to be congratulated on the opportunity of securing in separate form this really great article, probably the ablest in the entire Dictionary. The volume has an excellent modern map of Palestine in the time of Christ. Dr. Sanday is at work on a large and more exhaustive work on the life of Jesus, but there is more of value in this volume of Outlines than in most of the large volumes. It is not a book for popular reading, but every well-educated and thoughtful student will find abundant reward for the reading. It will be some years before the larger volume of Dr. Sanday is ready. There is no lumber to cumber the pages of this book, but a deal of honest work and candid dealing with the great problems raised by the life of the Son of God.

A. T. Robertson.

Principles of Literary Criticism and the Synoptic Problem.

By Ernest DeWitt Burton. University of Chicago. 1904. $1.00 net. 72 pages.

This is a careful attempt to formulate principles by which to solve the Synoptic problem. It is a very difficult subject and requires balance of judgment. Dr. Burton is not, of course, dogmatic in his method, but he makes a very interesting tentative programme for the criticism of the Synoptic Gospels. This little book will help any who are endeavoring to plough through the mazes of critical theories about the literary sources of the Gospels and who do not care for Rushbrooke's Synopticon or Wright's Synopsis.

A. T. Robertson.

Die Sittenlehre Jesu und ihre Bedeutunfgur die Gegenwart.

Von Lic. theol. Ph. Bachmann, Professor der Theologie in Erlangen. A. Deichert (George Böhme), Leipzig, Germany. 1904. Pages 60. Price 1.20 m. To be had through Lemcke and Buechner, New York.

These lectures Prof. Bachmann delivered in 1903 before the Evangelical Woman's Union of Nuremburg. Naturally they are popular, but they are none the less incisive and fresh. There is a simplicity and directness of statement not always present in the writings of German theologians. The aim of the book is distinctly practical and modern. The application of the ethical teaching of Jesus to the present time is a worthy theme. Tolstoi is a standing witness to the ease with which a great mind can miss the mind of Jesus. The author rightly sees that we are not to follow slavishly the life of Jesus. This is where Rev. C. M. Sheldon missed it in his famous book *In His Steps*. It is not so much what Jesus did then or would do now that is pertinent to us. The real ethical problem in Christ's teaching is what does Jesus wish us to do now. It is to this question that Prof. Bachmann earnestly addresses himself.

A. T. Robertson.

The Messages of the Apocalyptical Writers.

By Frank Chamberlain Porter, Ph. D., D. D., Winkley Proffessor of Biblical Theology in Yale University. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1905.

In this volume Prof. Porter undertakes to present Daniel, the Revelation and the Jewish Apocalypse in such historical setting that the reader may be able to understand them. There is abundant scholarship in the introductory notes. Prof. Porter calls Daniel a tract for the Maccabean times, and denies that the apostle John is the author of the Revelation, but he has no satisfactory hypothesis for the authorship of Revelation. The judicious student can get much help from the historical material furnished by this volume, but it is a region of much difficulty, and one must not be dogmatic.

A. T. Robertson.

III. OLD TESTAMENT.

Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts and Letters.

By C. H. W. Johns, M. A. Charles Scribner's Sons. New York 1904. 424 pp.

This book is the sixth in a series of nine volumes, entitled "The Library of Ancient Inscriptions," under the general editorship of Charles Foster Kent, Ph. D., and Frank Knight Sanders, Ph. D., D. D. The publishers say: "No effort has been spared to make the entire series a complete and standard compendium of the best fruits of modern oriental scholarship and of the important results of the excavations, conducted during the past century, in Babylonia, Assyria, Arabia, Syria, Palestine and Egypt." The literary form and typographical skill displayed in the volume before us leaves little to be desired; and the book is both scholarly and popular.

The Code of Hammurabi, which was discovered and published in 1902, naturally occupies a large place in the discussion of ancient Babylonian laws; and the student who is familiar with Prof. Johns' little book, entitled "The Oldest Code of Laws," will be pleased to note the many improvements in the translation of Hammurabi's Code. The literary form of the present translation is far more pleasing than the severely literal rendering found in the small volume referred to, and the author evidently understands the Code better after months of additional study.

Prof. Johns first traces the development of Babylonian law from the earliest period through the time of Hammurabi down to the Assyrian and later Babylonian period. He next sketches the social organization of the ancient Babylonian state. Then he tells what is known of the judges, courts and legal processes in that early time.

The learned author is well acquainted with the contract tablets, many thousands of which have been unearthed

and stand in European and American museums. These he combines with the Code of Hammurabi and the remnants of other codes, when he would set before the reader the laws and customs that prevailed in ancient Babylonia and Assyria. He displays a good deal of skill in selecting from the immense mass of available material the bits of information that best illustrate Babylonian legal procedure. He has chapters on such subjects as "Courtship and Marriage," "Divorce and Dissertion," "Obligations and Rights of Children," "Slavery," etc. The social and commercial life of the early days of human civilization are portrayed in an interesting and informing manner.

There has been a good deal of discussion as to the character of the votaries named frequently in contract tablets and in the Code of Hammurabi. Prof. Johns thinks they were eminently respectable women. "Vowed to God, usually to Shamash at Sippara, or Marduk at Babylon, there seems little to connect her with the prostitute votaries of Ishtar at Erech." "She remained a virgin, even if married. She could have no children and must provide her husband with a maid, if he wished to have a family."

The ancient Babylonian and Assyrian letters in the latter part of the book under review are of great interest and value. After pointing out how these letters illustrate the civil and military history of the time, Prof. Johns continues: "The letters are also a rich mine of information on all sorts of topics, and those very often on which almost all other literature are silent. We gain here a closer and more intimate acquaintance with humanity than at any other period of ancient history. Here are letters from kings to governors and generals, and from officers and private persons to rulers. From the private letters of the First Dynasty of Babylon perhaps the following love letter is the most interesting: "To Bibea say, thus saith Gimil-Marduk: May Shamash and Marduk for my sake preserve thy health forever. I have sent for

thy health. Tell me how thow art. I went to Babylon and did not see thee. I was greatly disappointed. Send me the reason of thy leaving, and let me be cheered. In Marchesvan do thou come. For my sake keep well always.'' Prof. Johns thinks that Bibea was perhaps the writer's wife.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

IV. CHURCH HISTORY.

John Knox. His Ideas and Ideals.

By The Rev. James Stalker, D. D., Professor of Church History, United Free College, Aberdeen, Scotland. A. C. Armstrong & Son. New York. 1904. 250 pp.

Dr. Stalker is well known to English and American readers through a number of excellent works on various New Testament subjects. The present work introduces him in a new field. He was recently elected Professor of Church History at Aberdeen, and this is his first publication in that position. It is offered as a contribution to the celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the birth of Knox. The author has not contributed to our knowledge of either Knox or his work, and the style bears marks of haste in preparation. The first part of the work contains an interesting sketch of the life of Knox while, the last two parts, on his Ideas and Ideals, are largely made up of lengthy quotations from the work of Knox. The book is popular, and if it leads the Scots and others to a renewed study of the great Reformer it will have served a good purpose.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Saint Paul and the Ante-Nicene Church. An unwritten chapter in Church History.

By Rev. Stewart Means, A. M., B. D. A. C. Black. London. 1903. 349 pages.

The object of this work is to set forth the more important doctrines of Paul and then show how far the Ante-Nicene church, in its leading writers—such as the

apostolic fathers, Justin, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Tertullian—fell short of Paul. The work is well done. Nothing could emphasize more strongly than such a comparison the immeasurable superiority of the New Testament over the subsequent literature. Such a comparison constitutes a valuable apologetic.

W. J. McGlothlin.

The Church Covenant Idea. Its Origin and Development.

By Champlin Burrage. American Baptist Publication Society. $1.00 net.

Mr. Burrage has put together an interesting and valuable collection of material on his subject. The subject itself attracts interest and awakens curiosity, and the treatment is meritorious. The author has confined his investigations to England and New England. His book would have been more valuable had he extended his researches to the West and South. In literary form the book could be improved by the relegation of much of the matter to appendices, by less of repetition, and more attention to arrangement and style. He has not given us either a complete or a particularly readable discussion, but the material, gathered with commendable diligence and pains, has its own interest and worth, and so we are greatly indebted to the author for his useful contribution to an important and apparently neglected phase of Congregational and Baptist history.

E. C. Dargan.

The Holy Roman Empire.

By James Bryce, D. C. L. A new edition enlarged and revised throughout, with a chronological table of events and three maps. The MacMillan Company. New York. 1904. 575 pp. $1.50 net.

This valuable work has been before the public for forty years and has passed through several editions. It has now been revised throughout by its distinguished author, who is still in the maturity of his powers, and two valuable

chapters have been added, one on the Byzantine Empire and the other on the constitution of the present German Empire. Here and there the work has been somewhat enlarged and the whole has been brought into accord with the present state of historical knowledge. The book has long been an indispensable guide to the history of the Middle Ages, and its value has been greatly enhanced by the revision.

W. J. McGLOTHLIN.

V. SOCIOLOGY.

A History of Matrimonial Institutions. Chiefly in England and the United States with an introductory analysis of the literature and the theories of primitive marriage and the family.

By George Elliott Howard, Ph. D. The University of Chicago Press. 1904. Three vols. Price $10.50.

Perhaps no question is of more vital concern to the interests of morality and religion than the preservation of the family. The family is universally recognized as the great conservator of all that is highest and best in human life, ranking next to the Christian religion in this respect. Every man who loves his kind and loves his country must be interested in everything that affects the purity of married life and the sanctity of the marriage relation. The legal confusion in the United States on the subject of marriage and the laxness of marriage and divorce laws have long been matters of grave concern among the better classes of our people. The divorce evil seems to be growing. The strictness of marriage and divorce laws in one state is nullified by the laxness in an adjoining one. What we need first of all in our confusion and uncertainty is information, knowledge of what Anglo-Saxons have done along these lines. This information we have in abundance in the work of Professor Howard. It is the fruit of many years of labor and shows wide reading and investigation. These three substantial volumes contain an astonishing amount of information on

all phases of marriage and divorce. In Part I. the author treats the various theories of the primitive prehistoric BAPTIST EXPOSITOR—Galley 36
family, the rise of the marriage contract and the early history of divorce. In this section he has relied almost wholly upon the investigation and opinions of others, and the pages are loaded down with quotations. And while there is much curious information and brilliant speculation, this part does not contribute greatly to the practical value of the book.

In Part II. the matrimonial institutions of England are treated, including the rise of ecclesiastical marriage and the administration of matrimonial law by the church; the Protestant conception of marriage and the rise of civil marriage and present English law; and finally the history of separation and divorce under English and ecclesiastical law. These two parts compose the first volume and about one-fourth of the second. The remainder of the second volume and the whole of the third is devoted to a discussion of matrimonial institutions in the United States.

The author deals with the colonial period and then traces the course of marriage and divorce legislation through the century and a quarter of our history, closing with the problems of marriage and the family. He gives numberless quotations from the statutes of all the states of the Union, quotations from reports, etc. The work here is done first hand and it is every way admirable. The bibliography is large and well classified, the numerous footnotes contain much valuable information. In fact, the book is a library on the subject in hand. It will be found extremely interesting to intelligent laymen and preachers, and would be invaluable to legislators who are striving to deal intelligently with the immense and vastly important problems of proper marriage and divorce legislation. It is to be hoped the book will find a wide reading in spite of the fact that it is somewhat costly.

W. J. McGlothlin.

VI. BIBLICAL INTRODUCTION.

Historical Evidence of the New Testament.

By S. L. Bowman, A. M. S. T. D. Jennings and Pye, Cincinnati. Eaton and Mains, New York. 732 pp. Price $4.00.

This is an elaborate treatise designed to meet the sceptical issues of the day which deny the historical character of Christianity during the first three centuries. No other work, it would seem, has proposed to traverse this territory upon just the lines and in the form here adopted. It attempts to deal fairly and exhaustively in the light of modern discovery and research. The period between the crucifixion of Christ and the time when Constantine the Great established Christianity throughout the Roman Empire as the religion of the state—the only period concerning which there is any question raised touching the historicity of Christianity. "There is no period in the whole range of ancient history," the author aptly reminds us in the words of Rawlinson, "whereof we possess a more full and exact knowledge than we do of the first century of our era."*

The method adopted is, first, to employ the testimonies of the adevrsaries of Christianity in this period to confirm the statements of the apostolic writers, and thus prove the historicity of the sacred narratives; and, then, to use the testimony of the friends of Christianity, acknowledged to be authentic and credible, to confirm the testimonies of their enemies respecting the facts alleged in the historical part of the New Testament.

This mass of testimony is then re-confirmed by the new "finds'—not in the shape of documents only, but such relevant testimonies as have been gathered from monuments, arches, inscriptions, coins, superscriptions, etc., and from early Christian art.

Where important new witnesses have been introduced —as, for example, the monumental discoveries of Cava-

*Truth of the Scripture Records, American E., 383, Note 3.

lier de Rossi, Garrucci, and other Italian scholars who have illuminated the mysteries of the Catacombs and the early Christian art, or Dr. Heinrich Graetz, of Breslau, in his recent *History of the Jews*—there is given before the chapter dealing with such testimonies a pretty full epitome of the life and work of each of such witnesses.

Where use is made of such well-known works as Lardner's ten volumes of apologetic literature, for instance, the author has not infrequently made his own translations from the original languages in which the citations are given, and in all cases, where critical care seemed to call for it, he has wisely given the translation, and not the original, a place in the text, that the English reader might experience no break in the continuity of the thought; while the original of the citation is placed in a foot-note with proper references, that the scholarly reader may be able to examine it for himself.

A valuable *Appendix* makes accessible some important material which could not well be placed in the body of the work—e. g. Josephus's *Testimony of Christ,* with all the principal arguments, *pro* and *con,* respecting the genuineness of that famous passage; Pliny's *Official Letter* to Trajan; *The Logia* of our Lord, in Greek and its translation, etc. The *Didache,* or *Teaching of the Twelve* Apostles, and the celebrated *Muratorian Canon* are quite fully described and quoted from.

In a survey of the ancient versions of the New Testament the author brings the evidence down to date, dealing, briefly, of course, with the so-called *Sinaitic Syriac Gospel* discovered in 1895 at the St. Catherine Convent, Mount Sinai, by Mrs. Lewis and her sister, of Cambridge, England. These versions are shown to go quite far in filling up the gap between the writing of the Gospels and the first Greek manuscript of them dating about 325 A. D.

In the *Excursus* is given the Jews' Authoritative Edict for expurgating all references to Jesus Christ, with particular reference to opprobrious language applied to him in the Talmud.

Some important historical and chronological *Tabular Exhibits* and a full and accurate *Index* add to the value of the volume.

The author has given us a scholarly, up-to-date, and, in the main, judicious treatment of the historical evidence, old and new, covering this vital, initial, critical period of the history of Christianity.

The binding of the book is not the best and a few typographical errors mar its pages, but, for the most part, the printing and press work are well done and the style and the type help to make the reading easy.

We cannot but hope that the author's wish, that the work may prove helpful to the youth of the rising generation who have perplexities of doubt about the historicity of the New Testament Scriptures, and consequently primitive Christianity, may be realized; and that many a pastor may find it satisfying to his own mind and helpful to him in dealing with such doubters.

GEO. B. EAGER.

Historical Geography of Bible Lands.

By John B. Calkin, M. A. Philadelphia. The Westminister Press. 1904. 189 pp.

The author of this little hand-book is not an explorer, not even a traveler, but is an educator, and author of "A Geography of the World." The book does not aspire to be a rival of such elaborate works as George Adam Smith's "Historical Geography of the Holy Land." It is intended as a text-book, or ready reference book, especially for Sunday school or Bible class teachers. Written by one who has had wide experience both in teaching and in training teachers, and who has achieved a recognized success in his work on world-geography, it is not too much to expect for it a kindred success in its department. It covers all the lands of the Bible, shows acquaintance with the latest and best literature of the subject, and presents in well-arranged, well-proportioned and systema-

tized form just what teachers and students of Biblical geography most require to learn. It will prove greatly helpful to the average pastor and the average Bible reader. Such historical geographies helps us as nothing else can, at this remove from Bible lands, to reproduce the earthly scenes of the greatest of all dramas and histories and to place ourselves in position to see more vividly the life of the people who received the revelation of God which we have recorded in the Bible. From almost every page of the Bible there starts forth some hint of land or climate. Historical geography brings out all that and makes it concrete and real.

The book is well printed and bound, has fourteen beautiful, up-to-date maps, a full and accurate "pronouncing index," and five excellent closing chapters on the Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Greek, Maccabæan and Roman periods. The introduction says it is offered "at moderate price."

GEO. B. EAGER.

The Book and The Land.

By Rev. R. W. Van Schoick, D. D. New York. Eaton and Mains Cincinnati. Jennings and Graham. 1904.

This is a part of the ephemeral literature which has grown up around the World's Fourth Sunday School Convention held in Jerusalem April a year ago, and the end is not yet. The author tells how he took the trip at the suggestion of a friend, who "gave the money to pay all expenses," and says he determined to show his appreciation of his friend's generosity by writing a faithful chronicle of the best he might learn concerning the Book and the Land, which is a constant testimony to the Book. The outcome is quite a readable "chronicle," of chief interest, doubtless, to members of the party and the author's personal friends, which, however, in book form is very attractive, well printed on good heavy paper, and beautifully illustrated from photographs taken on the trip.

GEO. B. EAGER.

VII. CHRISTIAN LIFE.

Religion and the Higher Life. Talks to Students.

By William Rainey Harper, President of the University of Chicago. The University of Chicago Press. $1.00.

In these "Talks" President Harper will appear to many in a new role. The "Talks" must be judged in the light of their purpose. The "Higher Life" is not used in the hackneyed religious sense. He takes pains to distinguish it from "that which is below," and also from "that which we may call the highest." Yet, he says, "it is only the man who lives *the highest life possible for him to live* that may be said to live the higher life." In the very act of becoming associated with an institution of higher learning one announces his purpose to be of those who interest themselves in the higher things of thought and life. The "higher life" includes in its broadest sense, then, the spheres of art, philosophy, science and ethics.

Now the question arises, What has religion to do with this "higher life?" It is to that the lecturer addresses himself. The answers are negative and positive: Religion is not to be identified with—is not the enemy of—one or all of these. Religion is essential for the fullest development of all these phases of the higher life. Religion is "something as imperishable as the mind itself," taking on different form at different periods; but Christianity is taken as a concrete type of the religion of this day—"the highest and most perfect form of religion thus far developed." Now the religious spirit must have characteristics to work in harmony with art, philosophy, science and ethics.

In setting forth the nature of the religion which to-day will prove acceptable to men and women of higher thought, Dr. Harper maintains that it will be: (1) *simple*—truth is always simple; (2) *reasonable*—i. e., it must stand the test of investigation; (3) *tolerant*—one's neighbor must be allowed to differ; (4) *idealistic*—think of a

religion with no prophetic vision, devoid of poetry and music; (5) *ethical*—capable of inciting to righteousness the lives of those who accept it; and (6) capable of affording *comfort* in the time of trouble, *consolation* in the hour of distress—what neither art, nor science, nor philosophy, nor ethics can do. All this he essays to show "the religion of Jesus Christ" is, and can do. It is capable of adjustment to every individual. The greatest minds of nineteen centuries have found it so.

He recognizes in university life, as in the larger life of our day, special difficulties. Of different tendencies by nature, coming from different communities and environments, representing many phases of belief and unbelief, and a greater or less variety of opinions, forms of worship and religious activity, men and women here find the cultivation and manifestation of the religious spirit no easy thing. Amidst such confusion of ideas and interests the temptation is to suffer the religious life to be pushed aside. How shall a unifying and uplifting religious spirit be cultivated? To the multiform answer of that question he devotes himself in a dozen familiar but far-reaching talks like a man in earnest. In doing it he deals with such large subjects as the Religious Spirit, Loyalty to Self, Dependence and Independence, Certainty and Uncertainty as Factors in Life, College Experience an Epitome of Life, Our Intellectual Difficulties, Bible Study and the Religious Life, and America as a Mission Field.

The opinion that once prevailed, that in order to work together in the religious field, men must have the same theological beliefs and the same forms of worship, was wrong. In the future union of effort on the part of those holding different theological views and practicing different forms of worship may be expected to increase. But the hue and cry so common to-day against creeds can be justified, he maintains, only on the ground that it is directed against the effort to compel men to accept some form of belief, or all the details of any system of belief,

as a whole. From any other point of view it is possible. On the other hand, he rejoices that the range within which one may exercise his belief, without injury to his influence and without necessary change of ecclesiastical standing, is constantly widening; and that, parodoxical as it may seem, in proportion as larger liberty of thought, within reasonable limits, prevail, ethical standards are elevated. We may surely agree, he says, not only to permit, but indeed to encourage, the widest possible divergence of thought and belief within reasonable limits; and such divergence should serve, not as a mark of separation, but rather as a token of that freedom which alone is found in Jesus the Christ. We may join in a common effort to elevate the life of the school, the community, the state, and the nation; the effort to establish righteousness and truth on every side.

The book abounds in vivid pictures and interpretations of present day tendencies, perils and opportunities, and, though here and there it may provoke dissent, is well deserving of the serious attention of students, teachers and preachers everywhere.

GEO. B. EAGER.

The Master's Questions to His Disciples.

By the Rev. G. H. Knight. New York. A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1904. Pp. XV and 367.

This is a series of fifty-two "Meditations," based on questions asked by our Lord of his disciples. They are "meant for Christians" and "written in such a personal form that each reader may adopt them as his own." There is no logical or topical order in the arrangement. The author says there could not be. We may at least agree that there need not be, for meditations do not pursue a line determinable by the logical analysis of topics. One may find what suits the mood of the hour by consulting the table of contents, which gives both the questions, quoted in full, and the subject which the author takes for the study in hand.

For the most part the exegesis is true and the application appropriate. There is true spiritual insight and much help for the personal life. One closes a meditation always with a sense of having come again in contact with the mind and heart of the Master and feels stronger or more confident in the midst of life's meanings and mysteries.

The author has hit upon a suggestive idea and has worked it for the edification of the saints and the magnifying of the Lord.

W. O. Carver.

VIII. MISSIONS.

A Yankee on the Yangtze. Being a narrative of a journey from Shanghai through the Central Kingdom to Burma.

By William Edgar Geil, with one hundred full page illustrations. New York. A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1904. Pp. XV and 312.

The author has made a far journey to fetch a little load. He makes the confession—his statement on p. 310 ought to be a confession whether so intended or not—that the volume "has been written on the wing" and in all sorts of places and at all sorts of times. On this account he thinks it "should have a peculiar flavor," as, indeed, it has, its most striking peculiarity being that a man could have made so little of such a remarkable opportunity. Ninety-nine days traversing and transversing China gave one very exceptional opportunity for seeing, learning and recording for the information of his fellow-men. And truly Mr. Geil has made an interesting volume, which has several merits. For one thing, it is frank and friendly toward the reader; it is full of local and temporal coloring, even if one does feel at many stages—at most, indeed—that the coloring is far from completely representing the environment. There are some sane and sympathetic observations and advice about the relations of foreigners

and Chinese. Then there is a very generous and judicious praising of missionaries. Chinese characteristics are given, not didactically, but pictorially. The illustrations are varied, numerous, informing.

On the other hand, the author is too much concerned with his own personality and addicted to an inveterate habit of witticisms with very varying success. On such a journey his greatest pride seems to be the speed with which he traveled and the amount of labor he was able to get out of his coolies. There is a sameness that grows tiresome, and the general impression is of notes that needed editing and elaborating, and especially is there need of descriptive imagination. The publishers have done their work well, save that the proofreader grew tired in the last chapters.

It deserves to be said for the work that the reviewer read every word of it.

W. O. Carver.

IX. PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

Der Evangelische Gottesdienst.

Eine Liturgik nach evangelischen Grundsätzen, von Julius Smend. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1904. M. 3.60.

We have here a treatise—or, more accurately speaking, a collection of treatises—on the subject of Worship. The point of view is of course that of the present conditions in Protestant churches in Germany. But many of the principles and problems are of general and permanent interest. One who reads German will find much that is both interesting and helpful in these able discussions of a topic of perennial and vital concern to those who would make the worship of our churches strong and adapted to modern needs.

The fourteen topics of the chapters, or lectures, are as follows: The Proper Significance of Evangelical Worship; Preaching as Speech in the Worship; Prayer and Confession (creed) in Congregational Worship;

Management of Baptism (of course infant baptism chiefly); The Confirmation Rite; The Lord's Supper; Marriage Ceremony; Burial Ceremony; Dedication of Churches; The Church Room (building, "plant"); Times of Worship; on Worship, Art, and Arts (relation of art to worship, especially music); Congregational and Artistic Singing in the Worship; the Rendition of Bach's Music in Church and Worship.

As will be seen, many of these topics are national and denominational, and more appropriate to liturgical services than to others. But on those topics which appeal to all there is much valuable discussion. Thus, as to the proper meaning of worship, while the author emphasizes too much the moral and edifying value at the expense of the evangelistic, he does insist on having a worship which teaches and inspires to higher moral and spiritual living. Especially well does he bring out the point that brotherly love and true Christian fellowship is one of the genuine tokens of a real service. Again, in treating the place of preaching in the services, Professor Smend takes well reasoned ground between those who make nothing of preaching in comparison with the service, and those who make it the whole thing. Surely the middle ground is the true one. Nor does he fail to lay the necessary stress on the requisite preparation of the preacher for the modern demands upon him as teacher, orator, leader and example for his church.

But perhaps the most interesting and useful of the chapters are the two in which the author discusses the relation of art to worship and the use of popular and artistic singing in the church. It is a pleasure to recognize here the soundness of his views in the main. He shows that history and present conditions alike point out the need of such art as really ministers to devotion, and does not become a hindrance to it. Learned allusion is made to the historical bearings of the subject, and the author's own experience as a pastor in obtaining results from congregational singing is used as evidence of the

practical value of his suggestions. The lack, in even those parts of the book which come home to all, whether liturgical or not, is that not enough emphasis is laid on the scriptural teaching and authority, and on the evangelistic aim. But as a large-minded and judicious discussion of many of the problems of worship to-day, the book has notable worth.

E. C. DARGAN.

BOOKS RECEIVED

The Religion of the New Testament. By Prof. Dr. Bernhardt Weiss, of the University of Berlin. Funk & Wagnalls, New York. Price $2.00

The Messianic Hope in the New Testament. By Shailer Mathews. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 1905. Price $2.50 net.

Tor, A Street Boy of Jerusalem. By Florence Morse Kingsley. Illustrations by F. A. Eckman. Henry Altemus & Co., Philadelphia. Price 50 cents,

Bible Study Popularized. By Frank T. Lee. The Winona Publishing Co., Chicago. Price $1.25 net.

How to Master the English Bible. By James M. Gray. The Winona Publishing Co., Chicago. 1904.

The Perennial Revival; a Plea for Evangelism. By William B. Riley. The Winona Publishing Co., Chicago. 1904.

The School of Life. By Henry Van Dyke. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1905. Price 50 cents net.

The Bible; Its Origin and Nature. By Marcus Dods, D. D. Charles Scribner's Sons. New York. 1905. Price $1.00 net.

Immortality. By William L. Seabrook. The Vir Publishing Co., Philadelphia, London, Toronto. Price $1.00 net.

The Bible the Word of God. By F. Bettex. Jennings & Graham, Cincinnati; Eaton & Mains, New York. Price $1.50.

Hid in the Heart, Scriptures that a Child of Ten Should Know, selected and edited by Geo. E. Horr, D. D, American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia. 1904. Price 50 cents net.

The Progress of Helenism in Alexander's Empire. By John P. Mahaffy, C. V. O., D. D., D. C. L. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 1905. $1.00 net.

The Measure of a Man. By Charles Brodie Patterson. Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York. 1904. Price $1.20 net.

The Life of the Christian. By G. Campbell Morgan. The Bookstore, East Northfield, Mass. 1904. Price 50 cents net.

Evangelism. By G. Campbell Morgan. The Bookstore, East Northfield, Mass. 1904. Price 50 cents net.

The Pastor and Modern Missions; a Plea for Leadership in World Evangelization. By John R. Mott, M. A., F. R. G. S. Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, New York. 1904. Price $1.00 net.

Studies in the Religion of Israel. By Rev. L. A. Pooler, B. D. Edwin S. Gorham, New York. 1904.

A Pilgrimage to Jerusalem. By Chas. G. Trumbull. The Sunday School Times Co., Philadelphia. 1905. Price $2.50.

A Year's Wandering in Bible Lands. By Geo. A. Barton, Ph. D. Ferris & Leach, Philadelphia. 1904.

The Epistle to the Ephesians. By Joseph Parker, D. D., in the Devotional and Practical Commentary, edited by W. Robertson Nicoll, M. A., L. L. D. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York. 1905. Price per volume $1.25 net.

A Little Garden Calendar, for Boys and Girls. By Albert Bigelow Paine. Henry Altemus Co., Philadelphia.

The Social Evil in University Life. By Robert N. Willson, M. D. The Vir Publishing Co., Philadelphia. Price 50 cents net.

Moral Education. By Edward Howard Griggs. Second Edition. B. W. Huebsch, New York. 1904.

D. H. EWING & SONS

BUTTER, MILK AND CREAM.

Office and Depot: 312 West Breckinridge, Louisville, Ky.

TELEPHONE 1028.

Ice Cream made from Pure Cream.
Fruit Ices of All Flavors.

THE BYCK

$3.50 SHOE

For Particular Men are carried here in all Shapes and Kinds of Leather.

TRY A PAIR NEXT TIME.

338 FOURTH AVENUE.